# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 903 SP 033 734

AUTHOR Zheng, Jinyuan

TITLE An Exploration of the Pedagogical Content Knowledge of Beginning and Experienced ESL Teachers.

PUB DATE Feb 92

NOTE 115p.; Master's Thesis, Queens University.

PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Comparative Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Knowledge Level; Masters Theses; Student Characteristics; Student Needs; Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Experience; *Teaching Skills

IDENTIFIERS *Pedagogical Content Knowledge

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to investigate differences in the pedagogical content knowledge of beginning and experienced teachers of English as a Second Language (ESL), with respect to student and curriculum knowledge, lesson planning, interactive teaching, and postlesson reflections. Participants in the study, two beginning and two experienced teachers, were observed teaching ESL for 2 weeks and were interviewed prior to observation and following the lessons. Analyses of the data revealed that beginning teachers: (1) showed little knowledge of the students in class; (2) were unaware of the role that knowledge of students plays in teaching; (3) were less selective in the utilization of the information when planning; (4) were less able to design appropriate strategies to facilitate student learning; (5) encountered difficulty when attempting to modify instruction instantly; and (6) reported more varied, less selective postlesson reflections. Data suggest that the beginning teachers had not developed their knowledge of the students and their pedagogical content knowledge and therefore were less able to use their pedagogical reasoning skills and action to transform "subject matter knowledge into forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by the students" (Shulman, 1987, p. 15). Two lesson narratives are appended. (LL)

***********************************************************************
*    Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made     *
*                      from the original document.                    *
***********************************************************************

ED343903

# An Exploration of the Pedagogical Content Knowledge of Beginning and Experienced ESL Teachers

By

Jinyuan Zheng

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Education
in conformity with the requirements for
the degree of Master of Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jinyuan Zheng
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario, Canada
February, 1992

Copyright © Jinyuan Zheng, 1992

S033734

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# Abstract

This study investigates the differences in the pedagogical content knowledge of beginning and experienced ESL teachers in student and curriculum knowledge, lesson planning, interactive teaching, and postlesson reflections. The concepts "Teacher Knowledge" and "Pedagogical Reasoning and Action" proposed by Shulman (1986, 1987) form the basis of the study. The methods of the study were modelled after the study of Borko and Livingston (1989) with modifications designed to accommodate expected characteristics of ESL teaching. Two beginning and two experienced teachers were observed teaching ESL for two weeks of instruction and were interviewed prior to observation and following the lessons. Analyses of the data reveal that the beginning teachers showed little knowledge of the students in class and were unaware of the role knowledge of the students played in teaching. Unlike the experienced teachers, the beginning teachers were less selective in their use of the information when planning and were less able to design appropriate strategies to facilitate student learning. They encountered difficulty when they attempted to modify their instruction instantly and reported more varied, less selective postlesson reflections. Data from the study suggest that the beginning teachers had not developed their knowledge of the students and their pedagogical content knowledge. Therefore, they were less able to use their pedagogical reasoning skills and action to transform "subject matter knowledge into forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by the students" (Shulman, 1987, p.15). Findings of this study were consistent with studies of novice/expert differences in other subject matter areas (e.g., Berliner, 1986; Borko & Livingston, 1989).

# Acknowledgements

I am greatly indebted to my thesis supervisor Dr. Hugh Munby. I would like to express my sincere thanks to him for his support and for the time he so generously offered. I appreciate the belief he had in my abilities to undertake and complete this thesis. His encouragement, his patience, and his guidance throughout this investigation have helped me to understand that learning is a developmental process.

I would like to thank my committee members Dr. Jeff Bloom and Dr. Arlene Stairs for their valuable suggestions and constructive criticism.

A study is not a study without the participants. I am grateful to the administrator, the teachers, and the students who were involved in my research. Without their co-operation it would not have been possible.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Larry Miller, Dr. John Olson, Dr. Don Campbell, Dr. John Kirby, and other individuals who helped me a great deal throughout my studies at Queen's.

Last but not least, I owe special thanks to my family for their constant encouragement and care.

# Table of Contents

**Chapter 1: Introduction** 1

The Focus of the Study 1

Rationale and Literature Review 1

  Model of Pedagogical Reasoning and Action 2

  Pedagogical Content Knowledge in the Process of Reasoning 3

  Pedagogical Content Knowledge in ESL Teaching 5

  Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Novice/Expert Differences Studies 6

Purpose 12

Overview of the Thesis 13

**Chapter 2: Methods** 14

Participants and the Setting 15

Data Collection 18

Initial Analysis 20

Overview of the Analysis 21

**Chapter 3: Presentation of the Data** 22

Alice, the First Beginning Teacher 22

  Student and Curriculum Knowledge 22

  Lesson Planning 23

  Interactive Teaching 25

  Postlesson Reflections 27

Diana, the Second Beginning Teacher 30

Student and Curriculum Knowledge 31

Lesson Planning 32

Interactive Teaching 33

Postlesson Reflections 35

Rose, the First Experienced Teacher 40

Student and Curriculum Knowledge 40

Lesson Planning 41

Interactive Teaching 43

Postlesson Reflections 45

Linda, the Second Experienced Teacher 50

Student and Curriculum Knowledge 51

Lesson Planning 52

Interactive Teaching 52

Postlesson Reflections 54

**Chapter 4: A Comparison of Beginning and Experienced Teachers 60**

Student and Curriculum Knowledge 61

Lesson Planning 63

Interactive Teaching 66

Postlesson Reflections 70

**Chapter 5: Conclusions 76**

Summary 76

Conclusions 77

Student and Curriculum Knowledge 77

  Lesson Planning 78

  Interactive Teaching 79

  Postlesson Reflections 79

Shulman's Model 80

Limitations 82

Implications for Beginning ESL Teachers 83

Future Research 84

**References** **86**

**Appendix A: Lesson Narrative: Linda** **89**

**Appendix B: Lesson Narrative: Alice** **100**

**Vita** **108**

# Chapter 1

# Introduction

## The Focus of the Study

The focus of the thesis is on teachers' knowledge and the teaching of English as a second language (ESL). As shown below, the study is designed to explore differences in the pedagogical content knowledge of beginning and experienced ESL teachers. The concepts "Teacher Knowledge" and "Pedagogical Reasoning and Action" proposed by Shulman (1986, 1987) form the basis of the study. Because these concepts have not been applied to the field of ESL teaching, the study is also an exploration of the applicability of Shulman's model to this area.

The specific purposes of the study are given following the rationale and literature review which draws on current research in teacher thinking, teacher knowledge, and novice/expert studies. The chapter closes with an overview of the thesis.

## Rationale and Literature Review

The rationale for the study is based on Shulman's (1987) view that teaching involves transforming knowledge and skills into a form that students can understand. Central to this view are Shulman's concepts of pedagogical reasoning and action, which he describes as a complex process of "transforming subject matter knowledge into forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by the students" (p. 15). Because the study is concerned with content knowledge, the rationale begins with Shulman's account of pedagogical content knowledge. Next, the rationale argues for the importance of studying pedagogical content knowledge in ESL teaching. Here, attention is given to the demands of ESL teaching, to the literature on teacher training, and to the studies of novice and expert differences–an active area of research on teaching of mathematics and science. Finally, the rationale addresses the need to focus on pedagogical content knowledge of beginning and experienced ESL teachers, a neglected but central aspect in understanding the special character of what constitutes teacher knowledge in teaching (Shulman, 1987).

## Model of Pedagogical Reasoning and Action

Shulman (1987) proposes that pedagogical reasoning and action is a complex process involving the restructuring of subject matter knowledge for pedagogical purposes. For Shulman, this form of thinking involves a cycle through several stages of reasoning: comprehension, transformation, instruction, evaluation, reflection, and new comprehension, but the starting point and the terminus for the reasoning is an act of comprehension, because "to teach is first to understand....To reason one's way through an act of teaching is to think one's way from the subject matter as understood by the teacher in the minds and motivations of learners" (p. 16).

According to Shulman, comprehension alone is not sufficient. The usefulness of comprehension lies in its value for judgement and action. Thus the second stage of reasoning is the transformation stage, which requires some combination of preparation, representation, selection and adaption. Preparation involves perceiving and critically interpreting the materials of instruction as well as their teachability based on teachers' understanding of the subject matter; representation concerns thinking through the central ideas in a given discipline and identifying the alternatives of representation for the students; instructional selection deals with the reorganising of content through representation and adaption indicates the feasibility of the representations according to the characteristics of the students. Shulman argues that all these processes of comprehension and transformations serve only as a rehearsal in a plan for the performance of teaching in the classroom. However, these processes, "wherein teachers move from personal comprehension to preparing for the comprehension of the learners are the essence of the act of pedagogical reasoning, of teaching as thinking" (p. 15). Furthermore, pedagogical reasoning of comprehension and transformations does not come to an end when instruction starts. It will continue to occur during interactive teaching, evaluation, reflection and new comprehension as well.

## Pedagogical Content Knowledge in the Process of Reasoning

An important feature of Shulman's model of pedagogical reasoning and action is his view of the place and function of teacher knowledge. His theory states that pedagogical reasoning and action are based on various sources and types of knowledge held by the teacher. Of particular interest to the present study is Shulman's "pedagogical content knowledge," which is also closely to related and deeply influenced by two other categories of content knowledge: subject matter content knowledge and curricular content knowledge.

Subject matter content knowledge refers to the amount and organization of knowledge in a given discipline that a teacher possesses, including various ways of organizing the knowledge and the position of each topic in relation to other topics in the given discipline.

Curricular content knowledge represents an understanding of various instructional materials available in relation to the teaching of particular subjects or topics at a given level, knowledge of the topics and instructional materials in the same subject matter area from past to present, and knowledge of other subjects in the school curriculum.

Pedagogical content knowledge is a particular form of content knowledge because "it embodies the aspects of subject matter content knowledge germane to its teachability" (Shulman, 1986, p. 9). It is knowledge of formulating and presenting the subject matter to the students comprehensively and meaningfully in forms of powerful analogies, clear explanations, vivid illustrations and demonstrations. It also includes an understanding of the learners and their characteristics in learning. Shulman suggests that pedagogical content knowledge is both built with and built upon subject matter content knowledge and curriculum content knowledge. They together make possible the process of pedagogical reasoning and action. The importance of pedagogical content knowledge, Shulman says, has been neglected in research on teacher thinking and teaching, but it is central to understanding the special character of what teachers know in order to teach:

> Pedagogical content knowledge is of special interest because it identifies the distinctive bodies of knowledge for teaching. It represents the blending of content

> and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction. Pedagogical content knowledge is the category most likely to distinguish the understanding of the content specialist from that of the pedagogue (Shulman, 1987, p. 8).

## Pedagogical Content Knowledge in ESL Teaching

In the field of ESL teaching it is clear that competent teachers need to possess both the subject matter content knowledge of English as a second language and pedagogical content knowledge in order to carry out their professional function successfully. For example, Robinett (1977) claims that the first thing an ESL teacher must possess is a knowledge of the subject matter to be taught, but that it is not a knowledge of the English language only. It includes a linguistic awareness of what constitutes language, how language operates, how speaking and writing are related, how language reflects the culture of its speakers, how language changes with time and varies among speakers, as well as other aspects of the target language. In this view, being a native speaker does not qualify one to teach the language because he or she may lack the language-specific information such as phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical systems of English. In addition, as most of the ESL students come from different countries with various social, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds, knowledge of the characteristics of ESL students, their needs and problems in learning, are also crucial elements of ESL teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. In Shulman's theory, such knowledge is one of the essential prerequisites in teachers' pedagogical reasoning and action.

One can expect ESL training programs to be designed to provide prospective ESL teachers with the language-specific information to facilitate and enhance their teaching. The objectives of the ESL program at the Faculty of Education, Queen's University, may be taken as an example. Graduates of this program are expected to acquire a better understanding of the analysis of English with respect to its sound system, symbol system, morphology, and syntax, to increase their ability in selecting and adapting creative learning materials for the teaching of listening, speaking, reading, and writing according to the special needs of ESL students, and to be familiar with the Ontario Ministry of Education Guidelines and support documents in relation to the teaching of a particular discipline or topic at a given level.

## Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Novice/Expert Differences Studies

Recent research shows that there are qualitative differences in the thinking and teaching of novice and expert teachers. Information that is useful for expert teachers may hold little meaning for novice teachers. Also, expert teachers are more selective in their use of the information when planning and teaching, and make greater use of instructional and management routines (Berliner, 1986). In the past five years, inquiry into novice/expert differences in thinking and teaching has been particularly active. Studies accomplished to date of novice/expert differences have addressed several dimensions in the area of mathematics, science and social studies (Carter, 1991). For example, Calderhead (1984) discovered that experienced teachers seemed to have amassed a large quantity of knowledge, which not only influenced how subject matter will be considered, but also influenced classroom organization and management. Berliner (1986) noticed that experienced teachers seemed to know their new class even before they got to meet them. They seemed to know different home backgrounds of the students. They knew what kinds of activities students engaged in outside school and what kinds of experiences or skills students might possess. Therefore, they had an image of the likely number of the students that may need help and the types of the behaviours and discipline problems that could be expected. Rope (1987) also discovered that one salient difference between novice and expert teachers was their knowledge of the students and the impact of that knowledge on the form and substance of their interactions in teaching. He suggested that expert teachers' better developed knowledge of the students may enable them to predict misconceptions that their students may have and the areas of learning that those misconceptions were likely to affect. Housner and Griffey's (1985) study revealed that expert physical education teachers constructed elaborate managerial plans for implementing activities for their students. Novice teachers were able to plan logically well-formed activities for teaching. However, they gave considerably less attention than experts to how to carry out these activities in the classroom. As Neale, Smith, and Wier (1987) put it, being occupied with classroom organization and management issues prevented novice teachers from thinking about student conceptions and how to challenge them in teaching. In a study to explore social studies teachers' recall, representation, and analysis of classroom problem situations, Peterson and Compeaux (1987) suggested that the experienced teachers had significantly greater recall of classroom events than did novice teachers. Moreover, experienced teachers' discussions of alternatives and their potential impact on the interactive teaching events indicated that they had richer knowledge of the underlying structure or meaning of teaching and learning events. They argued that these comparatively more complex understandings may assist experienced teachers in accurately perceiving and appropriately responding to interactive teaching events. Carter, Sabers, Cushing, Pinnegar, and Berliner (1987) examined novice/expert differences in processing and using information about students. Their findings were consistent with Peterson and Compeaux's study. In another study to uncover high school history teachers' responses to students' questions, Carlsen and Wilson (1988) suggested that experienced teachers were more likely to break one question into several questions and use "follow up" strategies to assist students. Also, they were more likely to explicitly ask students questions in relation to historical events, and more capable of using smiles, laughs or humorous remarks to encourage students to ask questions.

However, in reading the research on teacher thinking and teaching, Shulman (1986) noticed that investigators have ignored one central aspect of the classroom life: the subject matter itself. The emphasis of the research, Shulman found, was on classroom organization and management. Little attention was paid to where teacher's knowledge for teaching came from, when and how they gained this knowledge, and in what way they present their subject matter content in class. In a word, the transformation of the subject matter content, or teacher's pedagogical content knowledge, has been missing in the study of teacher thinking and teaching. Shulman and his colleagues tried to redeem this imbalance through their research program "Knowledge Growth in Teaching" in the area of biology, mathematics, social science, and English as mother tongue language arts. Their research has revealed important differences between novices and experts, suggesting that novice teachers lacked the pedagogical content knowledge derived from classroom experiences to help them transform their subject matter content knowledge successfully both in their planning and teaching. For example, Gudmundsdottir and Shulman (1986) found in their study that the most dramatic difference between the novice and the expert was that the expert had developed pedagogical content knowledge that allowed him or her to view a classroom incident or situation within a large context, and which in turn, enabled the expert to select a strategy that did justice to the situation. In a similar study, Gudmundsdottir and Shulman (1989) noticed that the ability to create and communicate curriculum stories was an important element of experienced social studies teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Novice teachers were struggling to create and communicate their curriculum stories but only succeeded for small units within the curriculum. Nevertheless, they were getting a good start in the process of developing their pedagogical content knowledge both in unit organization and pedagogical flexibility. In another study designed to uncover novice/expert differences in English literature teaching, Grossman and Gudmundsdottir (1987) discovered that expert teachers were more likely to have elaborate and well articulated forms of pedagogical content knowledge. Expert teachers not only talked explicitly about their knowledge in teaching, but also explicated their knowledge in the forms of elaborate models. Grossman and Gudmundsdottir argued that these models represented expert teachers' centrepieces of pedagogical content knowledge because they enabled expert teachers to formulate well defined strategies for communicating their subject matter knowledge. The pedagogical content knowledge of the novices, on the other hand, was broader and less well defined. Although novice teachers expressed general goals that they wanted to accomplish like the experienced teachers, they had not yet developed well-defined strategies for putting their knowledge to use in teaching. The findings of Shulman and his colleagues are consistent with other novice/expert differences studies exploring pedagogical content knowledge.

In a study to uncover experienced teachers' transforming of the content into work tasks, Grant (1987) discovered that experienced teachers were able to select an organizing imagery to guide their transformation of the content and were able to identify high quality work tasks which would carry their organizing imagery to students when teaching reasoning. In another study to investigate novice/expert differences in teaching problematic instructional materials, Barnett and Cwirk-Godycki (1988) found that novices were often uncertain about what prerequisite skills were needed, whether students could understand, and which strategy would work. Their responses frequently contained words or phrases showing their uncertainty. They seemed to be searching for answers to questions about teaching, about students, and about subject matter content involved. Their responses were seldom grounded in experience, whereas when experienced teachers' responses contained expressions of uncertainty, they usually supported their speculations with detailed information based on their classroom experiences. Leinhardt and Fienberg (1989) conducted a study to examine the integration of mathematics teachers' subject matter knowledge with their knowledge of structuring effective representations. They indicated that experienced teachers' knowledge of specific representations permitted them to demonstrate in multiple forms both the problem and the ways to solve the problem. In a study to explore novice/expert differences in planning, in teaching, as well as in postlesson reflections, Borko and Livingston (1989) found that novice teachers were less efficient in planning; more easily deviated from scripted lesson plans when they attempted to be responsible to students' comments or questions in teaching; and reported more varied, less selective reflections in postlesson interviews. Borko and Livingston suggested that novices may not have the necessary knowledge and skills to adopt the complex patterns of interactive teaching displayed by experts in the classrooms. In comparison with the novices, experts in Ropo's study (1987) used more concrete examples to bring about student learning and focused more on analyzing students' responses to the work in order to plan future instructional activities and actions. Furthermore, expert teachers discussed the need and displayed the ability to change the plan for the lesson depending on the specific situations of the classrooms. In a similar study in the area of science teaching, Borko, Bellamy, and Sanders (1990) obtained the same results. They indicated that because expert teachers had well-developed and easily accessible pedagogical content knowledge, they were able to plan quickly and efficiently. They suggested that the success of the experts' explanations and demonstrations seemed to depend upon their ability to assess student understanding and to quickly provide examples when students showed confusion. From these and other studies Carter (1991) concluded that expert teachers, in contrast to novices, draw on richly elaborate knowledge structures derived from their classroom experiences to understand and interpret complex interactive teaching and learning events. This special knowledge appears to help them make highly accurate predictions about what might happen in the classroom.

As noted above, studies of novice/expert differences have been conducted primarily in the subject matter areas of mathematics and science (Borko & Livingston, 1989). No studies focusing on the subject matter content in the field of ESL teaching have been identified. Investigation into the pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical reasoning skills of beginning and experienced ESL teachers may greatly enrich the current description of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, which has not been described fully in the literature. The richly detailed description of instructional events gained from the present study may be very valuable to beginning ESL teachers in their planning and interactive teaching. In Berliner's (1985) words, beginning teachers need to possess such knowledge for developing their understanding of pedagogy.

## Purpose

There are two purposes of the study. The first purpose is to explore the differences in the pedagogical content knowledge of the beginning and experienced ESL teachers in student and curriculum knowledge, lesson planning, interactive teaching, and postlesson reflections. The focus is on the character of this knowledge and its application in instruction. The second purpose is to explore the theoretical background and the applicability of Shulman's (1986, 1987) concepts of "Teacher Knowledge" and

"Pedagogical Reasoning Skills and Action" to the area of ESL teaching.

## Overview of the Thesis

In chapter 2, details of the data collection methods of the present study are given. Chapter 3 presents the preliminary analysis of the data obtained during classroom observations and interviews. Chapter 4 examines the differences between the beginning and experienced teachers. Chapter 5 starts with a broad overview of the study and concludes with recommendations for further research.

# Chapter 2

## Method

This chapter is divided into three sections, the first describing the participants and the setting. The second section describes data collection methods used in the study. The third section describes the approaches used to analyze the data.

The focus of the study is on the differences in the pedagogical content knowledge of beginning and experienced ESL teachers in student and curriculum knowledge, lesson planning, interactive teaching, and postlesson reflections. The concepts "Teacher Knowledge" and "Pedagogical Reasoning and Action" proposed by Shulman (1986, 1987) form the basis of the study. The methods of the study were modelled after the study of Borko and Livingston (1989) with modifications designed to accommodate expected characteristics of ESL teaching. Borko and Livingston investigated the nature of pedagogical expertise by comparing the planning, teaching, and postlesson reflections of novice and expert mathematics teachers. Participants in their study were observed teaching mathematics on consecutive days for one week of instruction. They were also interviewed prior to each observed lesson about their instructional planning, and following the observed lesson about their reflections after teaching. Borko and Livingston suggested that the consecutive planning/observation/reflection cycles enabled them to "trace the evolution of sequences of instruction and the participants' reflections on subsequent planning and teaching" (p. 477). The present study modelled the planning/observation/reflection cycles but not on consecutive days in order to meet the specific time schedule of the participants. Also, the study used the terms "beginning" and "experienced" ESL teachers rather than "novices" and "experts" when years of teaching in ESL became an important element in selecting the participants. Furthermore, participants in the present study were asked to discuss their perceptions of the students in class and their perceptions of the school curriculum from past to present. The additional information was obtained because Shulman (1986) argued that knowledge of the students and curriculum are also essential elements in understanding the special character of what teachers know in order to teach.

## Participants and the Setting

The study was conducted in the spring and summer sessions of 1991 at a school of English attached to a university in Ontario. The School has four sessions in the school year: fall, winter, spring, and summer; and four levels: beginning, lower intermediate, intermediate, and advanced. There are three courses at each level, the reading course and the grammar course in the mornings and the listening/pronunciation course in the afternoons. Most of the students enrolled in the fall and winter sessions are international students from East Asian and European countries who want to improve their English in an English-speaking environment. Some of them are preparing for entry into higher education in an English speaking country. Others want to have oral fluency in English for their profession when they return. Nearly fifty percent of the students in the spring and summer sessions are French Canadians on bursary programs, planning to go to college or university some time later. Normally, there are 14 to 16 students in one classroom and the students usually study for one or two sessions although some of them may remain for a whole year. During the first week of each session, all incoming students have to take initial placement tests and diagnostic tests in reading and grammar respectively. The placement test is used to divide the students into ability groups represented by the four levels, whereas diagnostic test results serve to identify students who may have been placed in the wrong levels. In the fall and winter sessions, teachers at the School also interview the incoming students for better placement because they have fewer students and more time for instruction. There are regular textbooks for each of the three courses at the four levels at the School, but teachers are encouraged to use additional materials from the School library or from their own sources to facilitate student learning depending on the needs of the students in class (see the appendix A and B). Furthermore, it is highly recommended by the School that teachers assign a certain amount of homework to guide student learning. There is a final examination for the reading course and the grammar course at each level at the School. However, the teachers can decide how much weight the final examination will have. There is no final examination for the listening/pronunciation course, but the course teacher is encouraged to assign a certain amount of homework to facilitate student speaking after class.

Participants in the study were two beginning teachers and two experienced teachers from the School (all names are pseudonyms). Discussions with the administrator of the School led to the identification of the participants in the study. Alice, a beginning teacher in her early twenties, joined the School of English in May, 1991, after she graduated from university with a politics degree the previous month. She did not have any formal teacher training. She had limited teaching experience in drama and dance when she was a university student. At the time of the study, she was teaching the listening/ pronunciation course at the lower intermediate level. Linda and Rose, two experienced teachers in their forties, both have had ten years' teaching experience at elementary school and at the School of English. They were selected for their strength in ESL training and their performance in ESL teaching. At the time of the study, Linda was teaching the reading course at the lower intermediate level whereas Rose was teaching the reading course at the beginning level. All the participants expressed their willingness to be involved in the study when they were asked by the School administrator and the researcher herself. Diana, another beginning teacher who was in her late twenties, began her participation in the study after the data collection had started with other teachers. She graduated from university with a life science degree in May, 1989. She did not have any formal ESL training. However, she had one year of second language learning experience and teaching experience. She spent one year in France learning French following her graduation from university. While there, she gave French students English conversation lessons in an art school. In late July, the researcher met Diana at the School of English and in conversation discovered that Diana was quite willing to participate in the study. Diana therefore became the second "beginning teacher." At the time of the study, Diana was teaching the grammar course at the lower intermediate level for the second summer at the School of English.

## Data Collection

Data collection covered a period of three months from June to August. Because the spring and summer sessions at the School of English, conducted during the months of June, July, and August, were very condensed with the classes held in different buildings around the campus, it became clear that it would be impossible to follow the model of planning/observation/reflection cycles (Borko & Livingston, 1989) on consecutive days. Therefore, it was arranged that Alice, the first beginning teacher, and Rose, the first experienced teacher, would be observed and interviewed for the first two weeks whereas the rest of the teachers would be observed and interviewed in the following weeks. In the first two weeks, Alice was observed four times and interviewed three times, while Rose was observed five times and interviewed three times. In the following weeks, Linda, the second experienced teacher, was observed seven times and interviewed four times. Diana, the second beginning teacher, was observed only twice because she participated in the study so near the end of the summer sessions. Nevertheless, she was interviewed four times.

The observations were guided by a set of general questions about the nature of the instructional activities and teachers' instructional strategies in order to identify any relationships between participants' statements in their pre-interviews and their actions in classroom teaching. An audio recording was made of each observed lesson. Field notes were taken during the observations and were elaborated immediately after each lesson, with reference to the audio recording.

Participants were interviewed prior to the observation about their instructional planning, and following the observed lesson about their reflections after teaching. All interviews were conducted at times and places appointed by the participants. Each interview lasted about thirty minutes and was tape-recorded for subsequent transcription and analysis. The interviews were semi-structured and the interview questions were carefully prepared so as to match the purpose of the study and to make the researcher's intention explicit to the participants. The pre-observation interviews focused on participants' instructional planning. Participants were asked to discuss the nature of the course they were teaching, their perceptions of the students in class, their perceptions of the curriculum at the School, what additional materials were used in the course, how they planned their lessons, how they decided what to teach, what they were thinking about when they planned their lessons, and what approaches were used to transform their subject matter content knowledge in teaching in their planning. Postlesson interviews examined participants' reflections after teaching. They were asked to give the reasons for choosing a specific teaching strategy or teaching method in the observed lesson, how they challenged their students, how they dealt with their students' misconceptions. Participants were also asked to talk about any changes in their knowledge or thinking as the result of their teaching, and about the sources of their teaching strategies. During the postlesson interviews, unstructured or spontaneous questions were successfully employed to uncover participants' interpretations of episodes they discussed without being prompted by the researcher.

## Initial Analysis

Each interview tape was transcribed immediately after the interview to increase likelihood of remembering the content where the tape was indistinct. The categories from the components of Teacher Knowledge (Shulman, 1986) and the Model of Pedagogical Reasoning and Action (Shulman, 1987) were used as a category guide in the initial data analysis. First, pattern analysis was employed in the analysis of the data. Each transcribed dialogue was examined carefully in order to identify any patterns explicitly relevant to the category. Once those patterns were identified they were grouped into the categories according to their contents. Such pattern analysis was done across the transcribed dialogues of the same participant so as to create a single account of each participant's statements and activities. This form of presentation advanced the analysis considerably because it gave the researcher a complete picture of the transcript in which new patterns could be detected. In addition, it enabled the researcher to find participants' consistent themes across the interviews in identical forms, since some views that the participants expressed in the early interviews were repeated in later interviews. Second, a separate case description of each participant was prepared using the categories of student and curriculum knowledge, lesson planning, interactive teaching, and postlesson reflections. Knowledge of the students and curriculum are placed in a single category because Shulman claims that knowledge of the students in class and knowledge of the curriculum at the school are essential elements in understanding the special character of what teachers know in order to teach. Thus, this category enabled the researcher to investigate the interactive thoughts of the beginning and experienced teachers about their knowledge of the students in their different stages of pedagogical reasoning. Third, all case descriptions were examined for patterns of similarities and differences between beginning and experienced teachers so as to compare the present study with other studies of novice/expert differences.

## Overview of the Analysis

The analysis is presented in two parts: The first part, chapter 3, presents the preliminary analysis of the data. It reports the data obtained during classroom observations and interviews. Chapter 4 examines the differences between the beginning and experienced teachers in this study with special attention to novice/expert differences in other studies.

# Chapter 3

## Presentation of Data

This chapter presents the preliminary analysis of the data; it introduces the four participants in the study by reporting data obtained during the interviews and classroom observations. Separate case descriptions of the participants are presented under the categories of student and curriculum knowledge, lesson planning, interactive teaching, and postlesson reflections.

### Alice, the First Beginning Teacher

Alice was in her early twenties. She joined the School of English in May, 1991, after she graduated from university with a politics degree the previous month. She did not have any formal teacher training. She had limited experience in teaching dance and drama when she was a university student. At the time of the study, she was teaching the listening/pronunciation course at the lower intermediate level.

### Student and Curriculum Knowledge

Alice indicated that most of the students at the School came from East Asian and European countries preparing for higher education in an English speaking country. Therefore, the School of English tried to emphasize both academic and international aspects of the ESL program. In her view, "there is very little difference" in students' abilities between the two classes that she taught although the classes were formed according to students' placement scores.

Alice said that she liked the textbooks offered by the School because they included many activities for students to work on in pairs. Students could correct each other first in pairs and she could help them when needed. She explained that she was aware of her limited knowledge in terms of choosing additional materials to facilitate student learning, "This is my first summer in the School of English, so I really don't know what it is." Therefore, she "made an effort to ask many different teachers what they found useful in class."

Alice appeared to have a general knowledge of the students at the School and the school curriculum for the ongoing session. She knew where her students came from, for what purpose they studied at the School, what placement tests incoming students had to take for placements, and what textbooks are available at the School that could be used changeably depending on the needs of the students in class. However, she showed very little further knowledge of the students in her class and of what materials were appropriate to facilitate student learning since ESL teaching was "brand new" to her.

## Lesson Planning

When Alice was asked what she thought about when she planned her lesson, she said, "I like to get the students to speak as much as possible, so I look for materials that would allow them to speak....I try to find original material, a material that's written for English speakers." She indicated that when she looked for additional materials, she tried to find those materials that she remembered when she was a young girl. She said that she was very interested in combining materials written specially for ESL teaching with materials that were written for native speakers so as to "partly expose the people to the culture that they are learning." According to Alice, her adult students were interested in the materials that young people liked, and the language was appropriate for ESL students. But she explained that she was not sure what material was appropriate for the students in her class:

> I just learn how to choose the material that is appropriate for the level. Sometimes I have to go and ask Rose (an experienced teacher at the School) whether it is too difficult for them. I find if I go to the children's section in the library I will find a lot of things there. But the thing is, are they appropriate?

In discussing the specific plans that she would prepare for the class, she said:

> I guess I tried to structure my class in a way that I would find interesting if I were a student. I didn't want to spend too much time just speaking in front of the class, just lecturing, so as I was planning I was mentally going through what it would be like as a student, to be sitting in that classroom, and then I planned according to the time I had, about 50 minutes. So I broke everything down into the time block and tried to do as the same way that would be interesting for the students and get, you know, the message of that lesson for the day across.

She tried to recall what she had thought about before the summer sessions:

> I guess I try to get my lesson plan ready, I am not sure. I would, I was definitely nervous in my first class teaching, so I had all the pictures in my mind of all the things that I would go wrong but I was also very excited to try. I guess

I just try going there as prepared as possible.

When Alice planned her lessons, she tried to use her own experience as a student in the classroom. She emphasized using materials written for native English speakers because "these people are more natural in conversation experience and I like to get students to speak as much as possible." When she looked for additional materials, she tried to find those materials that she remembered when she was a young girl. However, she encountered problems in choosing the "appropriate material" for her students. To solve this, she "made an effort to ask many different teachers what they found useful in class."

## Interactive Teaching

Alice always came to the classroom about ten minutes early and chatted with her students before class began. She liked to ask students how they spent their weekends and whether or not they had any exciting stories to share in class. She usually divided her class time into three parts: the first one for listening comprehension; the second one for pattern drills; the third one for group activity. For example, in one class, she gave each student a copy of a poem describing a little boy's hobby of collecting various small and useless things. The poem had a large number of nouns with plural endings, which was what students had to learn in the lesson. Alice asked students to listen to her the first time and to read after her the second time. Her reading was clear and fast, but students did not show any difficulty in following her since they all had a copy of the poem with them. When a student asked what "squeak" meant in the poem, Alice imitated the cries of a mouse running away from the classroom and told the students that the squeak was the sound made by the mouse. When another student asked the meaning of "hug," Alice acted a mother hugging a baby to make her meaning clear. She explained later that she was a "very physical person," therefore it was very easy for her to use physical movements to "act out." After the poem, Alice moved to the second part, pattern drills. She asked each student to make up two sentences, using the plural nouns and the special patterns that she showed in class. Moreover, each student was to repeat the former speaker's sentences. Consequently, the last speaker was to repeat all the sentences made by the students in class. Alice spoke rapidly and asked students to follow her instructions immediately. When she noticed that students did not follow her instructions, she repeated her words the second time. Alice seemed unaware that students, especially the lower level ESL students, had difficulty in following her instructions when she spoke fast and her sentences were very long; even when she repeated her instructions, she kept the same speed. When Alice saw that students could not follow her, she repeated her words a third time. Then she asked the student next to her to add a noun to the sentence for something the student liked to eat. After the first student started to make sentences, the other students did not show any difficulty in making sentences. After the last student finished making her sentences, Alice asked each group of four students to prepare a short play in ten minutes and perform it in class. The short play was to have a place, a problem and a solution. Each of the four students was to act a part in the play. Students appeared eager to act and immediately formed four groups by themselves. One enthusiastic group even invited the researcher to act as a guard in its play. When the groups performed in front of the class, they all performed well and the whole classroom was full of laughter.

Alice appeared to be aware of the skills that she wanted her students to learn in class. She was able to plan logically well-formed instructional activities for teaching. Also, she was able to use demonstrations to make her meaning clear when students had problems with specific words. However, she lacked the ability to assess student understanding and was unable to provide proper explanations when students became confused. She was more capable of showing and teaching students to perform the short play when she moved to group activity. Perhaps she had developed a few strategies for communicating her ideas about the play from her experience of teaching dance and drama.

### Postlesson Reflections

In her postlesson interviews, Alice expressed strong and clear goals that she wanted to achieve with her students. To her understanding, the main purpose of the listening/pronunciation course was to get students to speak as much as possible. She indicated that she emphasised having her students "pronounce each syllable that should be pronounced and learn a little bit about stress and intonation."

Alice said that students in her class had to interview someone outside the School and hand in their transcripts of the interview as their homework at the end of the session. The reason for the interview assignment was:

> I want them to get experience listening to another native English speaker besides

> the teachers. I thought that would be a good opportunity to find someone to speak with who had shared common interests. For example, there were two maths students in my class who went out to find a mathematics professor to interview, and they could never interview any ESL teachers about mathematics, so it's a good opportunity for them to talk about a subject that interests them in English.

Alice taught two classes of the listening/pronunciation course at the same level on Monday and Tuesday afternoon. When she was asked if she kept the same lesson plan for the two classes, she replied:

> Today I began with a quick review instead of studying with the poem. This put the poem into context. I also decided to go through the play as a group first and then in small pairs, and then go through the words with them in pairs rather than as a group.

The reason for such a change was that "students are able to work better in pairs" and she could "get the specific problems there."

Alice seemed pleased to have the opportunity to teach two classes at the same level:

> It was particularly nice to have two classes, where I taught the same thing two days in a row because on Monday I would go in with my lesson plan and I would see how it went, and the places where there were any problems I could fix it for Tuesday. So that was really nice.

Therefore, in her view, "the Tuesday class definitely got better."

When Alice was asked how she found out her students' misunderstandings, she said that she liked to ask students questions or look for reactions in class to "get inside information," or "when I do the oral exercises at the board, that is the good way to tell." Alice stressed that it was very helpful for her to get feedback, because when she heard any mistakes she could go back and correct them.

Alice seemed to rely considerably on her drama and dance experience because she "personally found it's fun and interesting." In her view, drama was a very easy way to get people to speak more comfortably "if they can put on the character and pretend to be someone." She suggested that her examples and demonstrations came from "her own personal experience mostly" because of her drama and dance background. She said that she was surprised to find "how much similarity" there was between ESL teaching and dance and drama teaching although they were quite different, yet "some of the basic techniques, I find, are very much the same, just break down the things (teaching) to the simple steps and build on what they already know." When she was asked what was her favourite method in teaching, she said, "I guess it's difficult for me to talk about methods because I don't have any formal training in teaching English as a second language. I like to use my drama experience in class and I found that works really well."

When she was asked how she felt after she finished teaching, she replied, "you could think about everything you could have done differently." She indicated that the most frustrating thing for her as a new teacher was when students were not motivated and she was "pulling teeth." However, she said that she was very pleased to discover that teaching was something that she "really" liked. Her future plan was to get formal teacher training in ESL teaching.

When Alice shared her reflections with the researcher, she addressed several concerns about her own effectiveness and about her students. In her view, the main purpose of the listening/pronunciation course was to get students to speak as much as possible. However, she seemed to lack effective ways to make her students speak as much as possible after class. The only homework that she assigned for the whole session was the interview assignment which appeared to lean more on students' listening comprehension ability than on speaking ability. Alice appeared to rely considerably on her dance and drama experience and was often uncertain about choosing the materials or the strategies. As a new teacher at the School, she was pleased to have the opportunity to teach the same content twice because it enabled her to revise her lesson plan and immediately try out her revision the following day.

## Diana, the Second Beginning Teacher

Diana was in her late twenties. She graduated from university with a life science degree in May, 1989. She did not have any formal teacher training. However, she had one year of second language learning experience and teaching experience. She spent one year in France learning French following her graduation from university. While there, she gave French students English conversation lessons in an art school. After she returned from France, she worked at various times as a secretary, a receptionist, a shop assistant, and a private tutor in English conversation and French conversation. She also took some Japanese courses in university for the purpose of teaching English in Japan later. At the time of the study, she was teaching the grammar course at the lower intermediate level for the second summer at the School.

## Student and Curriculum knowledge

Diana appeared to have a general knowledge of the students at the School. She knew where her students came from, for what purposes they studied at the School, and what placement tests incoming students had to take before they had any formal instruction at the School. Diana indicated that "there were differences in maturity" between the two classes that she taught in comparison with the classes that she taught last summer. Therefore, she had to "adapt the teaching a little bit."

Diana said that she liked to use the grammar book that she borrowed from her friend because:

> This book has very practical usage of the English language with very well described grammar rules. But I found in a lot of the textbooks when you look at the grammar the rules are very complicated and they use a lot of unnecessary items. So this book provides some of the terms but mainly focuses on how to use that structure in context.

Diana believed that every book had its strengths and weaknesses. For example, she said, the terms in many books were too complicated for lower level students, "you have to go through each one and I have looked at it a lot and chose different elements from each book to make up my own curriculum." She further explained:

A lot of people tend to use specific examples and one sentence or phrase but the

> students, for instance, the verb tenses, you know, they know how to write the present tense or the past tense whatever, but they don't know how to use it if they have to put it in the story. They get confused because they know the forms and understand some of the rules but they don't know how it sounds in context.

She stressed that she did not use one book for the entire class in her grammar class, "I would use different books and get ideas and then make up my own."

Diana appeared to have a general knowledge of the students in her class and tried to use this knowledge when she chose additional materials for her students. Her approach in choosing the materials was to "keep practical" and "teach them how to communicate practically." She thought that students could refine their grammar when they made progress, "but at the lower level it's best to help them really express themselves." For this purpose, she tried to obtain "practical" ideas from different books so as to make up her own "curriculum."

### Lesson Planning

Diana indicated that she liked to "incorporate two things" when she planned her lessons:

> Usually 15 to 20 minutes I need to talk and go over some kind of grammatical points since that was what I was teaching. Or, if I've read different exercises, written work and stuff by the students, and they seemed to all have similar problem or problems, I go over that at the beginning of the class. Then, I like to have time for the students to interact among themselves where someone

> comes up and does a little talk, or the other students ask questions or have activities where they have conversations among themselves.

Diana explained that she prepared a very general outline for each week, but it varied considerably depending on the level of the class she was teaching. She said that she wanted to "go over certain grammatical points in class" each week, but she would modify that each day, or each second day.

As a relatively new teacher, Diana indicated that she was aware of her lack of experience in teaching, therefore, she tried to "overplan" her lessons:

> What I am always trying to do is overplan so that I have more materials than I need for each class because sometimes, especially if you are new you are not sure how much material you need to go, you know, go effectively in an hour and a half hour class. An hour and a half hour is quite a long period of time....So you want to be keeping the class interested.

When Diana planned her lessons, she seemed to engage in several levels of planning from weekly to daily planning. She prepared "a very general outline" for each week but modified it each second day according to the level of the students in her class. As a relatively new teacher, her approach to "go effectively" was to "overplan" her lessons in order to have enough materials to keep her students interested in the "long period" of the class hour.

## Interactive Teaching

Diana always came to the classroom about fifteen minutes early for her class, carrying a tape-recorder as well as her books. She liked to take time to make everything ready before class began. Diana usually divided her class time into three parts: the first one for grammatical points; the second one for grammar exercises; the third one for listening to music or discussions. In one class, she spent one third of her class time going over those grammatical points that she said were important for the final examination. Diana seemed to be aware of the difficulties that the lower level ESL students may have had in listening comprehension, because she managed to speak very slowly and used simple terms during her explanations. Sometimes she would use humorous remarks to encourage students to ask questions in class. After the review, Diana returned students' written assignments and went over the exercises with them one by one. She first asked students to give the right answer and the reason for the choice. If the student could not explain the reason for the choice, she asked another student to try before she gave the explanation to the class. Only five or six students paid attention to what Diana was explaining in class. Many students were either looking at their own mistakes or talking quietly between themselves. Diana appeared to notice what her students were doing because she often asked those students who were not attentive in class to answer her questions. After the exercises, Diana let students listen to a song on her tape-recorder. She gave each student a copy of the songbook and briefly explained the words and the meaning of the song in class. This song was sad, describing unhappy events of the contemporary world. Students appeared to appreciate the song because they were all very attentive when Diana explained the meaning of the song. Some of them even sang quietly when they listened to the song for the second time.

Diana seemed to concentrate on the skills that she wanted her students to learn in class. She was able to make her meaning clear by speaking slowly and using simple terms. However, she returned students' assignments before she gave explanations about the assignments in class. Consequently, only five or six students paid attention to Diana's well prepared explanations about the written assignments. Many students were either looking at their own mistakes on the assignments or talking quietly between themselves. Perhaps Diana lacked the classroom teaching experience that would enable her to identify the "best time" to give the explanations in order to guide students towards the intended learning.

## Postlesson Reflections

According to Diana, the main purpose of the grammar course was to "teach students how to communicate most effectively," but she wanted to follow the school curriculum closely. Therefore, she had two purposes for her grammar class. The first purpose was for students to finish certain exercises on grammatical points so that they could "pass" the final examination. She pointed out that the verb tenses and the words to connect the ideas were the two most important things that she liked to deal with, and then "you have a lot of little grammatical points in between." However, she said, "that's only half of what I like them to know." The other half or the second purpose was to "use these rules that they have memorized in context when they are doing a piece of writing or presentation." For this purpose, she put much emphasis on their participation and oral presentation in class, using those specific tenses that were taught previously, "because I don't think the final examination is necessarily a good indicator of how well they have been able to memorize." During the oral presentation, she wanted to make sure that "nobody is too shy, and they don't mind getting up and speaking, that they feel at ease so that they can communicate their ideas effectively." She stressed that for students learning a language the most important thing was to "understand the expressions of the language." She pointed out that in daily life "if you listen, there are so many expressions and idioms that grammar can't teach you."

She explained that in class she had to keep in mind how much time she had "because you have so much time to cover certain points." Nevertheless, she found that she could depart from her plan and do other things. What she liked to do was to "have a basic curriculum of course but really look at what the students are doing, see what they need, to be able to express themselves more clearly, know what problems they have."

Diana said that she found it necessary to incorporate vocabulary and reading skills in her grammar class, "otherwise the students would know a lot of rules but they still won't know how to speak or read in English." She explained that some students could not speak in class or write clearly although they could memorize things for passing the examination. "I'd rather that they write simply but clearly." Therefore, she liked to "concentrate more on conveying the idea rather than the verbs, nouns, adjectives whatever."

Diana had her own understandings of whether her lesson plan worked or not when she was asked about it:

Sometimes you find something doesn't work, as well as others and it depends on

> how the class is feeling and how you are feeling, or sometimes you just try to explain and people don't understand. These things are regular things that happen, so what I would do is go home at night and try to think of another way to approach the problem, to introduce that into class the next day.

When she was asked what she would do if her students could not understand what she taught, she said:

> I would think up another way very quickly to explain the point, or I'd ask someone else in class if they have any ideas. Sometimes students can explain things better than the teacher can because they understand the real problems of the students.

Diana explained that she tried to prepare as much as she could. But if she found that she could not solve the problem in class, she would say, "Look, I don't know how to deal with this right now. I'll try to get more information for you tonight and be prepared tomorrow." She admitted that it might be a point that she really did not know, or a point that she had not prepared.

Diana said that she tried to identify students' misunderstanding through their written assignments, focusing on specific grammatical points. In discussing the ways to deal with students' problems, she said, "I try to search different books that would give different angles, different perspectives on them communicating the same point and introduce those." In her view, a teacher could make her students think about the answer or let them answer it themselves. She said that she liked to give students more exercises to work on or talk to them individually, but "that's up to the students, they have to do the work." However, she pointed out, "sometimes a student will never get it until later." She mentioned her own experience in maths when she was at the high school, "In maths, sometimes I just couldn't understand something no matter how many times the teacher explained, how many different ways...." Diana explained that if her students could not understand, she would ask them not to deal with that in class until later because she thought it was beyond their level.

Diana thought that the grammar course "can be very boring" if she gave her students "a list of rules and they write them down and do exercises." She stated that she liked to have her students discuss interesting topics or have them answer questions or compose sentences. Music was her favourite topic in class. She would let her students listen to the music and ask them to talk about it in class or write some comments about it as homework, using different types of tenses and different ways of writing. She said that sometimes she would bring in a painting. They would go over the knowledge of art or mood. She believed that in this way students could be "more laid back" in class with a less "structured atmosphere."

When Diana was asked where her explanations, examples, or methods of teaching came from, she said:

> They mostly come from talking with other teachers or friends who did sort of part time supply teaching or my sister is a teacher, so I got a lot from them, and reading books and just sort of my style, I guess...looking at different sources and picking out what I thought was appropriate, so just a mixture of things, you know. If you can just read one book, it says exactly, teach anything, it doesn't

work, you know.

Diana explained six weeks' time was a very short period. If she could have one year with them, that would be much easier, "because then you have a certain length of time where you can see their problems, assess them, and then really begin to teach." She indicated that the most difficult thing for her as a new teacher was when students got tired, when they had been to a party, or when they were not enthusiastic, and "you have to try to get them enthusiastic in class." She found that the most exciting thing in her teaching was when students understood something very difficult, "and all the teachers say that you see the light in their eyes."

When Diana shared her reflections with the researcher, she was relatively concise and organized. As a relatively new teacher, she said that she tried to follow the school curriculum very closely, teaching "certain grammatical points" for students to "pass the examination" at the School. To her understanding, the most important thing for her students was to learn how to use the grammatical rules effectively in their communication. For this, she put much emphasis on their participation in class. She indicated that she tried to prepare as much as she could, but if she could not solve the problem in class she would try to get the information for them the following day. In her view, some students would never understand something until later because it was beyond their level. Diana's explanations might be related to her inability to make her examples or explanations accessible to students when needed. For Diana, the grammar course was "very boring," therefore, she tried to use different ways to let students feel "more laid back" with a less "structured atmosphere" in class. She stated that she learned to teach by "looking at different sources and picking up what she thought appropriate for her teaching."

## Rose, the First Experienced Teacher

Rose was in her early forties. She started to teach at the elementary school level following her graduation from a faculty of education. As a supply teacher, she experienced many classrooms at different elementary schools, teaching everything from kindergarten to grade eight. She also taught immigrants basic English for a short time during her supply teaching. In 1980, she took some ESL training courses and started to teach part time at the School of English. At the time of the study, she was teaching the reading course at the beginning level as a full-time teacher.

### Student and curriculum knowledge

As the students came from different countries with various backgrounds, Rose indicated that "there is a mix of needs really in one class." In her view, placement tests and diagnostic tests offered her a lot of information about what she needed to teach in class.

Having enough variety in texts at the beginning level was the main concern when Rose prepared her materials. She stated that if the students planned to stay for two sessions, she could "perhaps be teaching the same skills but using different materials, really to prevent boredom." When she had repeating students or students "who won't progress very quickly" she could use different materials to "keep them interested."

Rose indicated that she liked to use materials from workbooks for elementary school teachers, however, she pointed out, "the core materials are things we ordered from catalogues and they are ESL materials especially."

Rose emphasised that knowing more about the incoming students, especially their needs and characteristics, was very important for her as a reading teacher, because she could choose "different materials" but teach "the same skills" according to the information she obtained.

## Lesson Planning

According to Rose, the beginning students all lacked vocabulary, therefore part of what she had to teach was vocabulary. She said that she usually centred vocabulary around their reading skills and most of the vocabulary was taught through the stories. When Rose was asked what she thought about while planning, she said:

> I guess when I plan a lesson I think about the reading skills that I want to teach, the ones yet that I have to cover. And I also try to have a balanced lesson with some listening, some speaking, some reading, both because I think students are more interested and although I am teaching reading, everybody here generally tries to do all three skills, listening, speaking, and reading. So I try to have some of that in every lesson...in fact that's one thing I think about when I plan my lesson.

Rose stressed that it was very important for her to know other teachers' teaching at the school of English when she planned her lessons. She said:

> I am really teaching the reading but I need to know what the structure (grammar) teacher is teaching so that our teaching complements each other and so we don't do the same activities. But that is much easier to do in the winter when the numbers are small and we have lot more contact. I think I learned a lot from them, I mean I am very fortunate and the people that I worked with are very generous and so one person has the idea the other person is very welcome to those activities and those ideas. It's really helpful.

Rose explained that because the number of the students varied a great deal each session, teachers at the School had to change their teaching assignments according to the number of the students they got. However, she said that when she was sure what she would teach in the coming session, she would do the following:

> I tend to sit down and plan the whole six to twelve weeks. In structure (grammar) I will plan what I will cover each week but then of course that will change to some extent, but unless you have a broad idea of what you are going to cover in the twelve weeks I don't think you will keep progressing at the paces, so I usually have an overall plan and then of course depending on the needs of the students. They may vary but you need something for change....If the students aren't progressing more so we may not cover as much material, but you will tend to cover in the order that you have decided at the beginning. It's just the quantity of the materials that's likely to change.

Rose said that she usually prepared an overall plan before the session, but she changed her plan considerably after she started to teach:

> I often plan even the whole six weeks but I found that inevitably, when I get to the classroom the first week is more exploratory trying to find out about the students because until you really know what kind of students you have, the other planning is very likely just a waste of time and you will end up having to change a lot of things.

Therefore, Rose said that she would like to read different kinds of textbooks, especially "sort of theoretical texts" before the session started. She would spend most of her time looking for additional reading materials or designing strategies or activities for the students once the session started.

Rose appeared to know what information was relevant to her planning and what information could be ignored. She viewed overall planning as very important because she needed to have a plan for change depending on the needs and characteristics of the incoming students. Meanwhile, knowledge of the other teachers' planning at the school was also important so that their teaching could complement each other's. Rose stressed that she aimed at a balanced lesson with some listening, some speaking, and some reading because students were more interested and because it was recommended by the School.

### Interactive Teaching

Rose always came to the classroom about twenty minutes early and wrote all the important words on the blackboard before she started the class. When students entered the classroom, she would talk with them briefly and ask them if they had any difficulty with their homework. She usually divided her class time into two parts: the first part for questions and answers about the pictures in one textbook; the second part for reading comprehension questions about the short stories in another textbook. For example, in one class, she first asked students to look at the pictures of how a young man saved a boy from falling from a high building. Then she asked students to answer questions about the pictures, using the words on the blackboard to connect their sentences if they could not think of a connecting word by themselves. Rose spoke very slowly and clearly and the pictures showed vividly the process of saving the boy's life. Students did not show any difficulty in answering the questions. Then Rose moved into the second part. She asked students to read the short stories and try to finish the reading comprehension questions by themselves before she explained them in class. When Rose noticed that a student had a problem with "soil" in the reading, she did not tell him directly. She first showed him the green grass outside the window. Then she asked him to look at the black stuff under the grass. When another student asked about the word "collide," Rose used physical movement to show him what "collide" meant here. Meanwhile, she drew two boats with the action of "colliding" on the blackboard. She explained later:

> I think it is very easy for a teacher to give them the answer, but if you can make them discover it themselves they can think slowly towards the answer, I think they remember better. It's very tempting to give them the answer, but I don't think they can remember.

She stressed that she had always been taught not to give the answer directly. "They will remember it and retain it more if they work out the answer themselves and I've just been convinced to attempt to make them do a little more thinking."

Rose seemed to have a deep understanding of the lowest level students in her class. She was able to use vivid examples and physical movements to make her explanations accessible to her students when they encountered problems in reading comprehension. Moreover, she was capable of combining examples and demonstrations into her presentations which seemed to guide her students towards the intended learning.

## Postlesson Reflections

Rose had been teaching the students "with the least ability in English" for the last few years at the School. According to her understanding, one of the important things in reading was "doing the actual reading." Therefore, she asked her students to read a lot in class because they needed help in the beginning. As soon as possible she let them read independently at home, but she pointed out, "you can't rely on them doing their reading unless you also assign something." Because students varied a great deal in their abilities, she said that her approach to making students think was to have them answer "at least one focus question" when she assigned homework. She explained that at the higher levels, students were asked to do a reading responding journal. But at the lower level she had to give students some easy questions to get their responses.

Rose indicated that she tried to expand students' vocabulary especially in the areas in which they were interested because:

> You learn a lot about students from the articles they choose....Sometimes when they pick newspaper articles that are related to their own field they actually find

> it's easier to read than the simplest stories I give them because they know something about the topic....The other reason we do it is we want them to expand vocabulary...to make their vocabulary not just passive but active so they will use it.

Rose said that she liked to correct as many students' answers as she could if she could manage the time although it was "very tedious" at the lower level. "That's one of the ways I can discover if they don't understand something." Another way to find students' problems was to "encourage them to ask questions." However, she stated that she could not rely on some students asking because they did not know. "You need to have some kind of written work or hearing, giving their answers orally, to be certain with their answers."

When she was asked where her examples, explanations, or demonstrations came from, she said:

> I think they are actually come from me but I have to think about it carefully. I mean certainly there is nothing from the textbooks that I can particularly think about. I think personally, I try to use only the English langauge....So I'm always trying to find these to explain a concept or even a word very simply, using easier terms that they have already known in English. I think just gradually you get the ideas from having worked with the lower level students which is what and where my most experience is. Also I worked with the elementary children before that in primary so I think it just comes very naturally to try to simplify things.

Rose explained that it was always in her mind that students needed variety when she was asked what was her favourite teaching method:

> I always try to have as I said some material with oral work, some are more quiet, seat work like reading or listening and I like to have those components in every class, usually listening, speaking, and reading in every class....In winter I will be doing more variety because we have students for 12 weeks.

Rose said that she belonged to a teachers' family, so she was always surrounded by people who were interested in teaching and in talking about teaching techniques. She also "picked up a lot of ideas" from other teachers in her supply teaching at the elementary school. She indicated that her supply teaching opportunity meant a lot to her:

> I think it was really helpful....Teachers use different techniques, maybe what I was taught long ago was not the only way to do it....In some ways I have been doing so much supply teaching, probably had the chance to see a lot of other teachers' techniques and various ways of doing things and you learned a lot, I think. Sometimes you don't get the chance to see that many other teachers actually in the way they do the things.

Rose acknowledged that she also learned a lot from being a member of TESL Ontario because it offered different workshops and conferences every year "with people who know a great deal about teaching." She emphasized that she went to those workshops or conferences "not just meeting but to gather teachers' skills." For example, she said, she got the idea of using drawings to illustrate concepts or vocabulary after she attended a TESL Ontario workshop. "I can't draw but I still draw pictures to explain things....You don't really need to know how to draw, even stick men can help students understand." However, she pointed out that she did not take everything for granted. Her ideas in teaching "just come from trial and error, what works." She thought that she had learned from her students:

> I think you can also learn from the students. The students might teach you. They are well-educated in their own languages, and often they have very good ideas about what works for them as far as learning the language. I think I learned a lot from them.

Having taught the beginning level for many years, Rose has become, as she said, "the specialist in the bottom level." She stated that from session to session students' abilities varied a great deal though they were all at the bottom level. Consequently she had to decide how much she could cover in each session. "It doesn't take long for you to learn that." When she found that students had too many problems with the material she had to abandon it and started using simpler and easier materials that she had because "They are just not ready for progress and I think if you found they are struggling too much or making too many mistakes they need to find something easier. Otherwise they get discouraged." Rose explained that she did the same thing when she interviewed incoming students for placement at the beginning of the session:

> We let them try a lot. We guess what level they should be in, and we have them read first few pages and if they have too many mistakes we take them out of it and give them a low and easier book because we want them to have success, and also we want them to read a lot but be able to read without having to use a dictionary all the time, to read independently, so we try to keep them on the level

where they are challenged but comfortable.

Rose seemed pleased to have different textbooks and additional materials at the School because when she had to leave out one book she had something else that she could use. She said that when she first started teaching at the School, she had to adapt the materials that she used in elementary school because there were few textbooks and materials available at the School at that time. Having taught the bottom level both at elementary school and at the School of English, Rose said that she could carry something from elementary school into ESL teaching, "It's different, but they have similarities, too. They are both trying to learn to read if that comes anyway." According to Rose, the second language students "don't have the vocabulary where the grade one students do, but they have a knowledge of how to study." She thought that this was an advantage for second langauge students because they could move and progress very quickly.

When she was asked what she thought about after she finished her spring and summer sessions, she said:

> I enjoy teaching and I really don't think it's the job you can ever perfect. You always, well, you never know enough. That's the thing to me. But the other problem is that the students are always changing, so you always have to change your techniques to some extent....I think that's why I enjoy reading about some of the books that are really more theory because I think you have to keep changing....

Rose explained that she liked to read certain kinds of books that were more theoretically based because after reading such books "you will think about the teaching rather than just doing what you learned all alone." For the same reason she went to different conferences because she could see how other people were doing things. Because the students at the School of English kept changing from session to session "you should at least try to be flexible and be ready to change to see their needs." However, she cautioned that the natural thing was not to change so "I should push myself to a certain level like thinking about what you are doing and trying to read."

According to Rose, one of the important things in reading was "doing the actual reading." Therefore, she tried early in the course to let students read independently but she would assign them "at least one focus question" to keep them thinking. Her approach to teaching reading was to keep them on the level where they were challenged but comfortable. She pointed out that her elementary supply teaching helped her a great deal because she was exposed to different teaching styles and different students. As the students at the School changed from session to session, Rose's approach was to keep changing, "try to be flexible and be ready to change" to meet the needs of incoming students.

## Linda, the Second Experienced Teacher

Linda was in her mid-forties. She started to teach at the elementary school following her graduation from teachers' college. After she developed a reading program for her school, she was appointed reading consultant for a county board of education, with responsibility for setting up and assessing reading programs at different elementary schools. She also worked as a volunteer for some time with socially disadvantaged children in a hearing impaired program and with illiterate people in a read and write centre. In 1980, she took some ESL training courses and became a full time teacher at the School of English. Since then, Linda had taught all the ability levels for the different courses at the School. At the time of the study, she was teaching the reading course at the lower intermediate level.

## Student and Curriculum Knowledge

Linda indicated that she learned a lot about the new students from interviewing them for placement, "so by the time we come to place them in classes I feel I really know the students quite well, so I have some ideas of their abilities before I even start to teach them, and I just build my expectations to the ability I think I have got." She admitted that she could not know her students really well in such a short time, "but you know what you will deal with." According to her understanding, the differences of the two classes that she taught were that one class could "catch quicker" and do more work than the other, but the latter was more talkative. Linda said that she had developed many of her own reading materials because there were very few texts "at the right level." She stressed that she liked to "find materials that the students are going to be interested in, so that when they are reading they are going to learn something, not just learning the language."

In Linda's view, knowledge of the students' abilities and characteristics in learning were very important to her, because she could build her expectations to the abilities that she obtained. She liked to find materials that would give students new information besides learning the language, and that would interest students, because "they are not going to read well if they are not interested in what they are reading."

## Lesson Planning

Linda indicated that she was always aware of the time when she planned her lessons and that she liked them to "fit neatly into the time slot." She preferred to "have lessons neatly organised so that they don't fall over the next." At the lower level she did not like to "sort of drag the reading over to the next day." She pointed out that many teachers tried to have a number of different activities in one class. "I don't do that. I just try to incorporate a variety into the existing lesson so some oral work, some board work, some written work, some pair work, all around one lesson." She explained that she was always aware of the skills that she wanted her students to get, such as sequential order, main ideas, and inference, the skills necessary for them to be good readers. "I think that those skills are always at the back of my mind when I plan the curriculum for these students."

When Linda planned her lessons, she was able to use student information from the placement tests and from the interviews with the students to help her decide content coverage. Also, she was able to "incorporate a variety" into one lesson, focusing on the reading skills that she wanted her students to learn in order to be good readers.

## Interactive Teaching

Linda always came to the classroom about thirty minutes early to correct students' written assignments or reading journals. When students entered the classroom, she would say "hello" to them and briefly talk with them, sometimes commenting on their assignments. She usually divided her class time into three parts: the first part for going over the written assignments; the second part for reading comprehension exercises or oral presentations; the third part for group activities. For example, in one class, she gave each student a copy of the exercises without returning students' written assignments and went over the exercises with them one by one. She explained later that if she returned students' written assignments in class, they "won't have an open mind" because many of them were "still looking at their own mistakes" while she gave the explanations. When she saw that a student had a problem with the word "during," she first asked one student to give the meaning. Then she asked another student to put "during" into a sentence before she gave the explanation to the whole class. She thought that if she let the students "produce the word" or had them "figure it out" they would remember it better. After the written assignments, Linda asked one student to give an oral presentation in class and asked other students to ask the speaker questions. When she noticed that only the students sitting on the right side were asking questions, she immediately asked some of the students on the left side to change seats with the opposite side. During the oral presentation, Linda used smiles and laughs to encourage students to ask questions. Sometimes she used humorous remarks to encourage those shy students to speak in class. Then, Linda divided the students into two big groups. She asked each group to have one student in front of the blackboard at the same time to draw a picture about the word that she showed them. The first group that could find out the word for the picture got the score. When the activity started, the two groups vied with each other in guessing the word on the blackboard in order to get more scores for their own group. Even when Linda told the students that the class was over, some students still asked Linda to give one more word.

Linda was very skilful at keeping the lesson on track while allowing her students' questions and comments to be springboards for discussion. When students had problems with specific words or concepts in the exercises, she was able to use concrete and personal examples to generate them instantly, going straight through to the core of the problem and using very few words but making these words accessible to students. Also, she knew the best time to give her explanations in class and was able to let students "produce the word" by themselves so as to guide the students towards the intended learning. Furthermore, she made her students interact actively with the reading through well designed and articulated activities.

### Postlesson Reflections

Linda indicated that she had two major purposes for her reading class. The first one was to develop reading skills, such as chronological order, main ideas, inference, vocabulary and context, "those are things that I concentrate on." The second one was to have her students respond to the reading either in their written or oral form because "there is no sense in reading if all you are is a passive reader...and you just sit there and don't do any thing."

Having the students respond to the reading materials was Linda's focus when she assigned homework. Students in her class had to write a reading journal to be submitted once a week, and to give an oral presentation about the reading in class. For the reading journal, she had three purposes:

> The first purpose is to get them to read more than just one article. They have to read a lot before they find an article that interests them and that they can read. So it's wider exposure to reading. Secondly, they can learn summarising skills...and thirdly, it gives them a chance to interact with the materials when they have to write the reading journal.

For the oral presentations, made after the reading journal, Linda had two purposes:

> They give oral presentations after they have done some reading, so they are responding to that and they make their vocabulary active. First of all by writing it and secondly by speaking it, so once they've read about the environment, written about the environment, and then spoken about the environment, and they have a vocabulary, an active vocabulary. But if they just read it, and that's all they do with it and answer a few questions, they won't retain the vocabulary.

Linda thought that if the students were interested in reading the articles, they would be interested in discussing them or presenting them in class. Furthermore, students had to simplify the information before they gave it back in class; even if they just gave "their own feelings" about the reading, they made their passive vocabulary active, because "the interaction with the reading is the most important thing." She explained, "That's why I do the reading journals and that's why I have them give oral presentations." She further explained, "If the reader does not interact with what he or she is reading, they may as well be sitting and knitting or watching TV because that's the difference."

Linda paid considerably attention to student speaking in class and corrected them each time. Later when she was asked the reason for seating arrangement in her class, she explained, "Yes, they have to be moved to be around because all the talkers were sitting on the one side of the room and everyone directs their attention to the talkers on the other side." In her view, speaking was also an important way of responding, "a way of making their passive knowledge active." She thought that most of the students wanted to speak. They wanted to improve their speaking. "It's unnatural to put them just in a speaking class." According to Linda, her assignments were "a fair amount of homework actually" whether they were written or oral.

When Linda was asked how she identified her students' problems in learning, she said that she found their problems by looking at their written work, because students' problems came through very clearly in their written work. "If they didn't write down for me I won't be able to hear them all," she admitted, "I won't necessarily be able to check all the comprehension, still written work, but I have to have." She explained that after students handed in their written work she made all the corrections, "cross it out and rewrite it for them" before she taught them individually after class. If there was a problem for most of the students she would give explanations for the whole class. However, she cautioned that "they won't have an open mind" if she returned their written work before she gave the explanation, "they were still looking at their mistakes, you see."

Linda said that she had very high expectations for her students, always expecting them to do perfectly. When she was asked if it worked for her students, she said, "I think it does. Students have told me sometimes...probably doesn't work for everybody, but I don't lower my standards. I alter them in some ways but I don't lower them. I expect them to work up to a certain standard." But she cautioned that she had to be very careful with some students, especially Japanese students, so that "I don't intimidate them." She said that she had to "watch" that because she noticed that if "the student doesn't feel comfortable the student's not going there."

When she was asked about the source of her examples, explanations, and demonstrations, she said:

> Well, I think that's just part of my personality. I'm very broad and very honest and I'm not one of these people who like to talk around in circles a lot. So I just go straight through to the core of everything, and maybe that's just my personality. I try to tell them in as few words as possible, so they can make connections between what I'm trying to explain and my new explanation. I think it's just a matter of using very few words but making those words very important.

Linda indicated that she liked to let students read independently. She tried to have a student-centred classroom where the students did all the work and the teacher just guided with clarification when needed, "but basically I believe the students should be doing the work, I just point them in the right direction."

Linda thought that her elementary and reading consultant experiences helped her a great deal in her ESL teaching. She indicated that the elementary school was skill-based because students did not read just for information, they needed to "develop critical reading skills and I think really my background in elementary school sort of points me in that direction." During her ESL teaching, she also took some ESL courses where "I was exposed to what's happening now in the public schools as compared to when I was teaching." She thought that the ESL field was following the elementary schools and "I just really kept up to what's happening in both areas." When she learned new methods or new knowledge she said that she tried to use some of them in her teaching, "not all of them, the ones I think work for me." Because the students at the School changed from session to session, Linda said that she had to be very flexible so as to match the needs and characteristics of the students, "For example, if I have returning students I have to do different things. And if I have repeat students at the same level....I have to have totally different readings and change my approach a little bit." Keep changing according to the needs and characteristics of the students were the main concern to Linda:

> Some experienced teachers don't change over the years. I must have learned. But I think part of the reason I change is that my student body changes so frequently. I think you can't continue in the same way if you've got different groups in front of you all the time....I change even in the middle of the class if something's going wrong and I have better ideas.

When Linda was asked how she felt after she finished the session, she said that she had mixed feelings about the summer sessions:

> On the one hand I knew they made a lot of progress. A lot of them made progress in their reading journals and in their speaking. On the other hand I

> know that there are skills that they didn't learn, and that bothers me....I know there are a lot of holes that I didn't cover this time and this bothers me. And that's why having such a short time to teach is very frustrating.

She indicated that the most exciting thing for her as a teacher was to see the students develop. "That's the real time for me when the students does something new that they weren't be able to do. It's just wonderful like a Christmas gift."

Linda's reflections were concise, focused, and well organized. Most of her thoughts about students focused on how to make students' passive knowledge active. According to Linda, "the interaction with the reading is the most important thing" in the reading course. Therefore, she tried to let students read more, speak more, and write more on the reading materials that interested them so as to make their knowledge not passive but active. She acknowledged that she learned considerably from being a reading consultant for different elementary schools and from being a member of TESL Ontario and having access to workshops, conferences, and the latest literature in the ESL field.

# Chapter 4

## A Comparison of Beginning and Experienced Teachers

This chapter examines the differences between the beginning and experienced teachers in this study with special attention to the novice/expert differences in other studies. It focuses on the pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical reasoning skills of the beginning and experienced teachers in student and curriculum knowledge, lesson planning, interactive teaching, and postlesson reflections.

Beginning and experienced teachers in this study have one important element in common: they had all developed their communication skills, or their subject matter content knowledge in their discipline to a certain level through their university education. However, there are two major differences related to their subject matter content knowledge. First, experienced teachers had developed knowledge of the students and curriculum, which not only influenced how subject matter was considered, but also influenced classroom organization and management. Beginning teachers were knowledgeable in their own areas of teaching: Alice in listening and pronunciation and Diana in grammar. Nevertheless, they had not developed their knowledge of the students and curriculum to help them transform their subject matter content knowledge. Second, there is a difference in the opportunities teachers had to re-define their subject matter content knowledge to construct pedagogical content knowledge. Linda and Rose both had been teaching ESL students for ten years besides their teaching experience at elementary school. Alice was in her first summer of teaching while Diana was in her second summer of teaching. Alice might have realized the need to re-define her subject matter content knowledge, yet she had not had much opportunity to do so. In comparison with Alice, Diana was better able to modify her instruction when she got the opportunity to teach the same course twice. Perhaps this opportunity enabled Diana to develop her pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical reasoning skills to some extent. In the following sections, the differences of the beginning and experienced teachers are presented under the categories of student and curriculum knowledge, lesson planning, interactive teaching, and postlesson reflections.

## Student and Curriculum Knowledge

The beginning and experienced teachers in this study differed in their routines for getting to know students and in the role knowledge of the students played in their teaching. Like the expert teachers in several other studies (e.g., Berliner, 1986; Calderhead, 1984; Ropo, 1987), the experienced teachers in this study seemed to know their new class even before they started to teach them. Both experienced teachers reported that they learned a great deal from the placement tests and from the interviews with the students before the placement. Therefore, they were able to build their expectations upon the information they obtained. For example, Rose indicated that the main purpose of the placement tests was to give her as a reading teacher the specific information about what she needed to teach in class. Whereas Linda said, "By the time we come to place them in class I feel I really know the students well, so I have some ideas of their abilities before I even start to teach them." Rose and Linda's better developed knowledge of the students seemed to enable them to predict what problems their students might have in learning and consequently influenced their decisions in what materials were likely needed in teaching. The experienced teachers' knowledge of the students, as Calderhead (1984) suggested, was complex and derived from experience, which not only influenced how subject matter was considered, but also influenced classroom activities and management. Alternatively, the beginning teachers appeared to have a general knowledge of the students at the School. Both beginning teachers knew where students came from, for what purpose they studied at the School, and what placement tests incoming students had to take before they had any formal instructions. Nevertheless, they showed little further knowledge of the students in their class. Their limited ability to see the relationships between knowing the students and the role knowledge of the students played in teaching reflected their limited knowledge of the students as well as their pedagogical content knowledge. This finding was consistent with Berliner's (1986) claims: information that was useful for the experienced teachers seemed to hold little meaning for the beginning teachers.

The beginning and experienced teachers differed in their perceptions of the school curriculum. Both experienced teachers stressed that it was very important for them to have a variety of materials available in order to meet different needs of the students in class. Rose pointed out that she liked to have enough variety for the beginning level students so that she could teach the "same skills" but choose the different materials to "prevent boredom." Linda mentioned that she had developed most of her own materials because there were very few texts "on the right level." She said that she liked to find materials that would give students new information besides learning the language and that would interest students, because students could not learn well if they were not interested. In contrast, Alice appeared to know the school curriculum for the ongoing session but she showed little knowledge of how to choose the material to facilitate student learning. She encountered problems when she had to decide which material was "appropriate" for her students as she said, "This is my first summer at the School of English so I really don't know what it is." In comparison with Alice, Diana appeared to have better knowledge of the students in her class and tried to use this knowledge when she chose additional materials for her students. In her view, the terms in many grammar books were too complicated for the lower level students in her class. Therefore, she liked to get "practical" ideas from different books to form her own "curriculum." Perhaps Diana was able to modify her instruction to some extent when she had the opportunity to teach the same course for the second summer. Findings of the present study appeared similar to the comments made by the student teachers in Borko and Livingston's (1989) study: the more they taught in the class the more they realized where the pitfalls were.

## Lesson Planning

In general, the levels and the characteristics of planning reported by the experienced teachers in this study appeared similar to the patterns seen in expert teachers' planning reported by Borko and Livingston (1989). Also, the experienced teachers in this study seemed to be more selective in their use of the information when planning, as suggested by Berliner (1986) and Ropo (1987), and more capable of changing their plans in order to meet the needs of incoming students in teaching. For example, both experienced teachers reported that they engaged in several levels of planning from overall planning to weekly and daily planning. During their planning, they were aware of the time for each lesson and the skills that students had to learn. Although they had prepared overall plans for the whole session and what they would cover for each week, they changed their plans to some extent depending on the needs of the students in class. Furthermore, they not only used the information from the placement tests and the interviews with the students to help them decide their content coverage, but also exchanged ideas with other teachers at the School so that their teaching complemented each other's. According to Rose, the first week's teaching was "more exploratory" because "until you really know what kind of students you have, the other planning is very likely just a waste of time and you will end up having to change a lot of things." But she pointed out, "unless you have a broad idea of what you are going to cover in the twelve weeks I don't think you will keep progressing at the paces." In her view, "it's just the quantity of the materials that's likely to change." Linda said, "I even change in the middle of the class if something's going wrong and I have better ideas." The beginning teachers, on the other hand, seemed less able to determine whether information was relevant or not possibly as a result of less classroom experience. They therefore had to consider much more information than did the experienced teachers when planning. Both beginning teachers said that they were aware of the impact their inexperience and lack of professional knowledge had on their planning. When Alice encountered problems in choosing "the appropriate" materials for students in her class, she "made an effort to ask many different teachers what they found useful." Whereas Diana's approach was to "overplan" her lesson when planning. She explained, "What I am always trying to do is overplan so that I have more materials than I need for each class because sometimes, especially if you are new, you are not sure how much material you need to go effectively." The levels of detail in the beginning teachers' planning appeared to support Borko and Livingston's (1989) finding that novice teachers were as planful as experts. Perhaps the level of details resulted from the selection of the beginning teachers with full teaching responsibility at the School rather than the student teachers in other studies who taught for short periods in another person's classroom (e.g., Leinhardt & Greeno, 1986).

Like the experienced teachers in Housner and Griffey's (1985) study, the experienced teachers in this study were better able to construct managerial plans for implementing activities for their students. Also, they had more variety in their lesson components in order to keep their students interested. Their better developed knowledge of the students and pedagogical reasoning skills seemed to enable them to design appropriate teaching strategies to facilitate student learning (i.e., group discussions and seat arrangements). Rose indicated that she liked to have "a balanced lesson with some listening, some speaking, some reading" because students were more interested and because this was recommended by the School. Linda reported that she liked to "incorporate any variety into the existing lesson with some oral work, some board work, some pair work, all around one lesson." In contrast, the beginning teachers were less able to design appropriate strategies to facilitate student learning. Therefore, they had to develop a few strategies for teaching their courses by adopting recommendations of other teachers or by adapting techniques that they encountered as students. For example, when Alice planned her lessons, she tried to structure them in a way that she thought would be interesting to the students, relying upon her own experience as a student in the classroom. When she looked for additional materials, she tried to find those materials that she remembered when she was a young girl. Similarly, Diana tried to look at different sources and to pick up what she thought was appropriate when she planned her lessons. The beginning teachers' searches for ways to present their subject matter content knowledge to the students seemed similar to the struggles reported by the novice teachers studied by Shulman (1987) and Borko and Livingston (1989).

## Interactive Teaching

Peterson and Compeaux (1987) suggested that experienced teachers' discussions of alternatives and their potential impact on the interactive teaching events indicated that they had richer knowledge of the underlying structure or meaning of teaching and learning events. They argued that these comparatively more complex understandings may assist experienced teachers in accurately perceiving and appropriately responding to interactive teaching events. The findings of this study were consistent with Peterson and Compeaux's (1987) study. The experienced teachers in this study were better able to assess student understanding in class and better able to modify their instruction when needed. Moreover, they used more concrete examples to bring about student learning, and they focused more on analyzing students' responses in class while planning future instructional interactions, as suggested by Ropo (1987). For example, Rose's approach to teaching the beginning level students was to explain things simply, using the words that students already knew in English. Sometimes she would act out or draw pictures on the board to make her meaning clear. Whereas Linda's approach was to use personal or concrete examples, going straight through to the core of the problem with few words but making these words accessible to students. The success of the experienced teachers' explanations and demonstrations, as Borko, Bellamy, and Sanders (1990) indicated, seemed to depend upon their ability to assess student understanding and to quickly provide examples when students showed confusion. It was precisely in these ways that the beginning teachers encountered difficulty. Alice ran into problems when she asked students to make sentences, using the plural nouns and the special patterns that she showed in class. Perhaps Alice lacked the ability to assess student understanding and was unable to make her explanations accessible to students when they showed confusion in following her instructions. In comparison with Alice, Diana appeared to be more aware of the difficulties that the lower level ESL students might have when she taught the course for the second time; therefore, she managed to speak slowly and used easy terms in her explanations.

Like the experienced teachers in Carlsen and Wilson's (1988) study, the experienced teachers in this study were better able to combine examples or demonstrations into presentations which seemed to guide students towards the intended learning. Also, they were better able to use smiles, laughs, and humorous remarks to encourage students to ask questions in class. For example, when Rose noticed that a student had a problem with "soil" in the reading, she first showed him the green grass outside the window. Then she asked him to look at the black stuff under the green grass. In her view, if the teacher could make the students discover the answer or "think slowly towards it" themselves, they would retain it better. She explained later, "I've just been convinced to attempt to make them do a little more thinking." When another student asked Linda what "during" meant in the reading, Linda first asked the rest of class to give the meaning. Then she asked students to put the word into a sentence and to give the meaning of the sentence in class before she gave any explanations. She explained later, "I don't just give them the word because they have to figure it out and they will remember that." The beginning teachers, on the other hand, were less able to demonstrate effective ways to make students work out the answer themselves, although Diana mentioned in her postlesson interviews that the teacher could make students think towards the answer or let them work it out themselves. As Neale, Smith, and Wier (1987) put it, being occupied with classroom management issues prevented the beginning teachers from thinking about student conceptions and how to challenge them in class.

As Housner and Griffey (1985) found in their study, the ability to anticipate situations likely to be encountered in teaching and to generate contingency plans for those situations was an important distinction between experienced and inexperienced teachers. The findings of this study were consistent with their study. The experienced teachers in this study seemed better able than the beginning teachers to predict where in a course students were likely to have problems in learning, and seemed better able to construct contingency and managerial plans for implementing activities for their students. The beginning teachers were able to plan logically well-formed activities for teaching.

However, they gave considerably less attention than the experienced teachers to how to carry out these activities in the classroom. For example, Linda and Diana both dealt with student misconceptions in class, going over the written exercises with the students one by one. Nevertheless, Linda knew when to give explanations in class so that students would have "an open mind" in learning whereas Diana did not. Consequently, Diana was unable to use her well-prepared explanations to guide students towards the intended learning.

The experienced teachers in this study were able to use rich and powerful examples, vivid demonstrations and clear explanations to present their subject matter content knowledge to students. Their knowledge of specific representations, as Leinhardt and Fienberg (1989)suggested, permitted them to demonstrate in multiple forms both the problem and the ways to solve the problem. Nevertheless, the beginning teachers' pedagogical content knowledge seemed particularly limited in terms of their presentation in class. Therefore, they had to develop their presentations as part of the planning process for each lesson. For example, Alice was teaching the listening/pronunciation course "two days in the row." She said, "On Monday I would go in with my lesson plan and I would see how it went, and the places where there were any problems I could fix it for Tuesday." Diana indicated that she tried to "search different books that would give different angles" but "communicating the same point." Sometimes she had to "go home at night and try to think of another way to approach the problem, and to introduce that into class the next day." However, she explained that it was sometimes beyond students' level because "you try to explain and people don't understand." Diana's explanation might be related to her inability to come up with an example or explanation accessible to students. The searches by Alice and Diana during their planning for ways to present content in their teaching appeared similar to the struggles reported by the novice teachers in several other studies (e.g., Gudmundsdottir & Shulman, 1986; 1988; Borko & Livingston, 1989).

## Postlesson Reflections

When the experienced teachers shared their reflections with the researcher, they were fairly concise, focused, and well organized. Most of their thoughts about students focused on student understanding of the readings. There was little mention of student behaviour in class. They were also very selective in their attention to specific classroom events, mentioning only those that they believed had an impact on the accomplishment of their instructional goals. They expressed definite opinions about their methods, stated specific methods to try, and gave firm assessments of the situations in class. Their responses were often made with the authority afforded them by their pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical reasoning skills. This high degree of selection in their reflections was similar to the patterns in experienced teachers' reflections reported by Borko and Livingston (1989). Alternatively, beginning teachers' reflections addressed more concerns about their own effectiveness and about their students. The beginning teachers were often uncertain about how to choose appropriate materials, about what kinds of material were needed to facilitate student learning, and about whether or not students could understand. Their expressions frequently contained words and phrases showing uncertainty such as probably, guess, not sure. Sometimes a whole sentence expressed uncertainty or speculation, "I don't know what it is." "I am not sure." Their responses were seldom grounded in their experience. For example, when asked about how to choose the "appropriate" materials to facilitate student learning, Alice replied that she "made an effort to ask many different teachers what they found useful". Whereas Diana indicated that she tried to "overplan" her lessons when planning so that she could have more materials than she needed in teaching. The beginning teachers seemed to be searching for answers to questions about teaching, about students, and about the subject matter content involved, as suggested by Barnett and Cwirk-Godycki (1988).

Like the experienced teachers in Grossman and Gudmundsdottir's (1987) study, the experienced teachers in this study were more likely to have elaborate and well articulate forms of pedagogical content knowledge. They not only expressed strong and clear beliefs about the purpose of the course, but also had effective ways to accomplish their instructional goals. These effective ways, as Grossman and Gudmundsdottir (1987) suggested, represented the experienced teachers' centrepieces of pedagogical content knowledge because they enabled the experienced teachers to formulate well defined strategies for communicating their subject matter content knowledge. For example, Rose and Linda both wanted students to become active readers. Such a concern for active reading was apparent in their two goals: (a) providing greater exposure to reading and (b) encouraging active interaction with the readings. Consequently, they made their students interact actively with the readings by letting them read more, speak more, and write more in class as well as after class. Rose indicated that she tried to encourage beginning level students to read independently early in the course if possible, but she would assign them "at least one focus question" to get their responses. She said that she liked to expand students' vocabulary in the areas in which they were interested. "Sometime when they pick up newspaper articles that are related to their own fields, they actually find it's easier to read than the simplest stories I give them because they know something about the topic." Rose thought that when students were interested in the reading they would use vocabulary. Linda reported that students in her class had to write a "responding" journal and to give an oral presentation about the reading in class. She thought that students had to read a lot before they found an interesting article they could read, which was viewed as providing a wider exposure to reading. Also, students got an opportunity to interact with the reading when they had to write their "responding" journal, which made their passive vocabulary active. When they gave their oral presentation in class, they had to simplify the information in their reading. Linda believed that even if students just gave their own feelings about the reading, they made their passive knowledge active. As a reading course teacher, Linda paid much attention to students' speaking in class and tried to encourage students to speak more in class by using discussions, group activities, and seating arrangement. In her view, speaking was also an important way of responding, "a way of making their passive knowledge active."

On the other hand, the pedagogical content knowledge of the beginning teachers was vaguer and less well defined. Although the beginning teachers expressed strong and clear goals, they had not developed well-defined strategies for putting their knowledge to use in teaching. For Alice, getting students to speak as much as possible was the main purpose in the listening/pronunciation course, but she seemed to lack knowledge of effective ways to make her students speak more after class. The only assignment that she assigned in her class was the interview assignment, which seemed to lean more on student listening comprehension ability than on speaking ability. Diana tried to accomplish her goals in a way that appeared similar to the experienced teachers. In her view, the main purpose of the grammar course was to "teach the students how to communicate most effectively." Nevertheless, Diana lacked the classroom experience that would enable her to identify the "best time" to give explanations so as to guide students towards the intended learning.

Like the experienced teachers in several other studies (e.g., Barnett & Cwirk-Godycki, 1988; Borko & Livingston, 1989), the experienced and beginning teachers in this study differed in the sources from which their experience might have come. Both experienced teachers said that their elementary teaching experiences helped them a great deal in their second language teaching, although their backgrounds varied a little bit from a supply teacher for different classrooms to a reading consultant for different elementary schools. They acknowledged that they benefited considerably from being members of TESL Ontario and from having access to different workshops, conferences, and the latest literature in the field of ESL teaching. For example, Rose said that she even learned a lot from her own students because many of her students were well-educated in their own languages and they often had good ideas about what worked for them in learning the language. However, she pointed out that some of the ideas in her teaching came from "trial and error." In terms of their examples, explanations, or demonstrations in teaching, Rose replied, "I think they actually come from me, but I have to think about it carefully." She thought that she obtained those ideas from having worked with the lower level students. Linda indicated that her way of explanation was just part of her personality. "I just go straight through to the core of everything and maybe that's my personality." She thought that "it's just a matter of using very few words but making those words very important." Alternatively, the beginning teachers seemed to rely considerably on their experiences that they encountered as students or on the recommendations that they obtained from other teachers. For the examples and explanations, Alice suggested that it was "her own personal experience mostly" because of her drama and dance experience. She said that she was a "very physical person," it was easy for her to use physical movements to "act out." Diana thought that it was "sort of my style." She suggested that she obtained them by "looking at different sources and picking out what I thought was appropriate." She said, "If you can just read one book, it says exactly, teach anything, it doesn't work." Apparently, teaching the same content more than once was a valuable learning opportunity for beginning teachers to develop their pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical reasoning skills, as Borko and Livingston (1989) found in their study. Diana took advantage of teaching the same course twice. Therefore, her pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical reasoning skills were better developed in comparison with Alice who had just started to teach the course. Also, Diana was better able to modify her instruction when she taught the same course the second time on the basis of what happened the first time. Even Alice was pleased to get the opportunity to teach the same course "two days in the row" because it enabled her to revise the elements of instruction such as examples and explanations and then immediately tried out the revisions in class the following day.

# Chapter 5

## Conclusions

This chapter presents the summary, the conclusions, and the limitations of the study. Also discussed are implications of the study for beginning ESL teachers and recommendations for future research.

### Summary

The study was designed to explore the differences in the pedagogical content knowledge of beginning and experienced ESL teachers in student and curriculum knowledge, lesson planning, interactive teaching, and postlesson reflections. The study was based on the concepts "Teacher Knowledge" and "Pedagogical Reasoning and Action" proposed by Shulman (1986, 1987). As Shulman's concepts have not been applied to the field of ESL teaching, the study was also an exploration of the applicability of Shulman's model to this area.

The methods of the study were modelled after the study of Borko and Livingston (1989) with modifications designed to accommodate expected characteristics of ESL teaching. Also, the study used the terms "beginning" and "experienced" ESL teachers rather than "novices" and "experts" when years of teaching in ESL became an important element in selecting the participants. Two experienced teachers, both with ten years' experience at the elementary school and at the School, and two beginning teachers, one in her first summer teaching and the other in her second summer teaching, participated in the study. Discussions with the administrator of the School led to the identification of the participants in the study. Data collection strategies included classroom observations, pre-observation interviews and post-lesson interviews.

The preliminary analysis of the data presented in chapter 3 provided the basis for a comparison of the beginning and experienced teachers in chapter 4. Here observed differences were found to be similar to those revealed in studies of beginning and experienced teachers in other subject areas.

## Conclusions

Data from this investigation revealed several differences in the pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical reasoning skills of the beginning and experienced teachers in terms of their student and curriculum knowledge, lesson planning, interactive teaching, and postlesson reflections.

### Student and Curriculum Knowledge

The experienced teachers in this study seemed to know their new class even before they started to teach them. Therefore, they were able to build their expectations upon the student information they obtained. Their better developed knowledge of the students seemed to enable them to predict what problems their students might have in learning and consequently influenced their decisions about what materials were likely needed in teaching. The beginning teachers appeared to have a general knowledge of the students at the School. However, they showed little further knowledge of the students in their class and encountered difficulty when they had to choose the "appropriate" materials to facilitate student learning. Their limited ability to see the relationships between knowing the students and the role knowledge of the students played in teaching reflected their limited knowledge of the students and limited pedagogical content knowledge.

## Lesson planning

The experienced teachers seemed to be more selective in their use of the information when planning and more capable of changing their plans in order to meet the needs of incoming students in their class. Moreover, they were better able to anticipate situations likely to be encountered in teaching and better able to generate contingency plans for those situations. The experienced teachers' planning could be described as a process of combining information from their knowledge of the students and pedagogical content knowledge to determine difficulties their students were likely to encounter and to devise appropriate explanations and demonstrations to prevent these difficulties. The beginning teachers, on the other hand, seemed less able to determine whether information was relevant or not because they lacked the classroom experience and pedagogical reasoning skills. Therefore, they had to consider much more information than did the experienced teachers when planning. They were able to plan logically well-formed activities for teaching, but they gave less attention to how to carry out these activities in class. Unlike the experienced teachers, the beginning teachers were less able to design appropriate strategies to facilitate student learning. Consequently, they had to develop a few strategies for teaching their courses by adopting recommendations of other teachers or by adapting techniques that they encountered as students.

## Interactive Teaching

The experienced teachers' rich and powerful examples, vivid demonstrations, and clear explanations appeared to enable them to demonstrate in multiple forms both the problems and the ways to solve them. Also, they seemed to use more concrete examples to bring about student learning and seemed to focus more on analyzing students' responses in class while planning future instructional interactions. The success of the experienced teachers' explanations and demonstrations seemed to depend upon their ability to assess student understanding and to quickly provide examples when students showed confusion. Nevertheless, the beginning teachers' pedagogical content knowledge seemed particularly limited in terms of their presentation in class. Consequently, they had to develop their presentation as part of their planning process for each lesson. They encountered problems when they attempted to modify their instruction instantly. Perhaps the beginning teachers lacked the ability to assess student understanding in class and were unable to make their explanations accessible to students when needed.

## Postlesson Reflections

The experienced teachers' reflections were fairly concise, focused, and well organized. They not only expressed strong and clear beliefs about their instructional goals, but also had effective ways to accomplish their goals. These effective ways, as

Grossman and Gudmundsdottir (1987) suggested, represented the experienced teachers' centrepieces of pedagogical content knowledge because they enabled the experienced teachers to employ their pedagogical reasoning skills to formulate well defined strategies for communicating their subject matter content knowledge. Alternatively, the beginning teachers' reflections were less focused than that of the experienced teachers and often uncertain about their responses. Although the beginning teachers expressed strong and clear goals, their limited pedagogical reasoning skills could not help them develop well-defined strategies for putting their knowledge to use in teaching.

### Shulman's Model

Shulman (1987) proposed that pedagogical reasoning and action is a complex process of "transforming subject matter knowledge into forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by the students" (p. 15). His theory stated that pedagogical reasoning and action are based on various sources and types of knowledge held by the teacher, of which the most important are pedagogical content knowledge, subject matter knowledge, and curriculum knowledge. These three types of knowledge make possible the process of pedagogical reasoning and action. Data from this study suggest that Shulman's (1986, 1987) concepts provide a useful perspective for investigating pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical reasoning skills of the beginning and experienced ESL teachers. Data reveal that the experienced teachers had better developed knowledge of the students and curriculum, and better developed pedagogical content knowledge; therefore, they were better able to use their pedagogical reasoning skills and action to assess student learning and better able to provide appropriate responses in planning, in teaching, as well as in postlesson reflections. In contrast, the beginning teachers had not developed their knowledge of the students and curriculum as well as their pedagogical content knowledge. Consequently, they were less able to use their pedagogical reasoning skills and action to assess student learning and less able to provide appropriate responses when needed.

Data from this study also suggest that Shulman's (1986, 1987) categories of "Teacher Knowledge" and "Pedagogical Reasoning and Action" are applicable to the area of ESL teaching because those categories enabled the researcher to investigate the interactive thoughts of the beginning and experienced teachers about their knowledge of the students. Although the beginning and experienced teachers did differ in important ways about their knowledge of the students, they were quite similar in how their thoughts were distributed across the categories. Data from this study indicate that the most dramatic difference between the beginning and experienced teachers was their knowledge of the students and the impact of this knowledge on the form and substance of their interactions in teaching. The experienced teachers in this study had developed their knowledge of the students; therefore they were able to transform their subject matter content knowledge comprehensively and meaningfully to their students. The beginning teachers were struggling to develop their knowledge of the students but only succeeded to some extent. This study does more than offer empirical support for Shulman's (1986, 1987) position that knowledge of the students is important to teachers' pedagogical reasoning and action. Research based on his framework has been in subject areas such as mathematics, social studies, and English literature where the teaching has been in English. In these contexts, the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of students have not been found to be particularly significant to pedagogical reasoning. In ESL teaching, these backgrounds are clearly germane because they give rise to the variety of problems students encounter as they learn the language. So the study provides evidence that knowledge of the students is a crucial element of experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical reasoning. The study suggests, then, that the importance of knowledge of the students may be underestimated in Shulman's theory simply because the theory has not been applied to the work of beginning and experienced ESL teachers.

## Limitations

Conclusions drawn from the study are necessarily limited by the fact that the study dealt with only two beginning ESL teachers and two experienced ESL teachers for two weeks of instructions. The purpose of the study was to investigate the pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical reasoning skills of the beginning and experienced ESL teachers, and to explore the applicability of Shulman's categories of teacher knowledge to the area of ESL teaching. Therefore, the generation of valid descriptions of the differences between the beginning and experienced teachers are important in this study. In this regard, it is concluded that the concepts of "Teacher Knowledge" and "Pedagogical Reasoning and Action " proposed by Shulman (1986, 1987) are a useful perspective.

The threat to the study's reliability due to the selection process was reduced by the careful procedures used in the study. Care was taken to avoid ambiguity in language, and postlesson interviews allowed the researcher to clarify ambiguities and to probe for richer understandings of the beginning and experienced ESL teachers.

## Implications for Beginning ESL Teachers

Data from this study support Borko and Livingston's (1989) finding that it was a very valuable learning opportunity for beginning teachers to teach the same course more than once, because the opportunity to revise elements of instruction such as explanations and examples and then immediately try out the revisions helps the beginning teachers to make them part of their pedagogical content knowledge. Similarly, by assessing student understanding in class in order to appropriately revise instructions, the beginning teachers start to develop their pedagogical reasoning skills and their knowledge of the students. For example, Diana took advantage of teaching the same course twice; therefore her pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical reasoning skills were better developed in comparison with Alice. Even Alice seemed to have developed her pedagogical reasoning skills to some extent after she taught the same course "two days in a row" because it enabled her to revise the elements of instruction such as examples or explanations and then immediately tried out her revision in class the following day.

Data from this study suggest that second language learning experience may assist the beginning teachers in developing their knowledge of the students. For example, Diana had one year of second language learning experience in France following her graduation from university. In comparison with Alice, Diana seemed to be more aware of the difficulties that the lower level ESL students may have in listening comprehension; therefore, she managed to speak very slowly and used simple terms during her explanations. Further research is required to investigate the interactions that may have between second language learning experience and the knowledge of the students.

Data from this study also suggest that knowledge of the students represents the experienced ESL teachers' centrepiece of pedagogical content knowledge because this special knowledge helps the experienced ESL teachers to "move from personal understanding to preparing for the comprehension of the learners" (Shulman, 1987, p. 15). Therefore, through discussions and explorations of the crucial role that knowledge of the students plays in the choice of particular strategies in planning as well as in teaching, ESL teacher educators could help beginning teachers build on the existing expertise of master ESL teachers; it is hard to begin a career by reinventing the wheel (Grossman & Gudmundsdottir, 1987).

## Future Research

Research comparing novice/expert differences has focused primarily on the subject matter areas of mathematics and science (Borko & Livingston, 1989). Shulman and colleagues' (e.g., Shulman, 1988) research has been limited to the knowledge of English as mother tongue language arts, social science, and mathematics teachers. Data from this study point clearly to the significance of further investigations of the beginning and experienced ESL teachers. For example, other studies could explore the differences of the pedagogical content knowledge of the beginning and experienced ESL teachers about the same course rather than different courses in this study. Also, similar methods could be used to investigate the differences between the beginning and experienced ESL teachers over a longer period of time.

One significant outcome of this study is an increased awareness of the ways in which ESL teachers' knowledge of the students may affect the nature of the presentation or explanations in teaching, and in particular about the transitions from beginning to experienced ESL teachers. The analyses of the study allow the researcher to explicate how ESL teachers' knowledge of the students affects the presentation of subject matter content in teaching. Further study is needed to more fully understand the interactions between knowledge of the students and presentation in teaching.

# References

Barnett, C. S., & Cwirk-Godycki, J. (1988, April). Learning to teach problematic instructional material: Cases from "experienced" and "novice" teachers. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans.

Berliner, J. H. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogy. Educational Research, 15, 5-13.

Borko, H., Bellamy, M. L., & Sanders, L. (1992). A cognitive analysis of patterns in science instruction by expert and novice teachers. In T. Russell & H. Munby (Eds.), Teacher and teaching: From classroom to reflection (pp. 49-70). London: Falmer Press.

Borko, H., & Livingston, C. (1989). Cognition and improvisation: Differences in mathematics instruction by expert and novice. American Educational Research Journal, 26, 473-498.

Calderhead, J. (1984). Teacher's classroom decision making. London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Carlsen, W. S., & Wilson, S. M. (1988, April). Responding to student questions: The effects of teacher subject-matter knowledge and experience on teacher discourse strategies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans.

Carter, K. (1991). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W. R. House (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 291-310). New York: Macmillan.

Carter, K., Sabers, D., Cushing, K., Pinnegar, S., & Berliner, D. (1987). Processing and using information about students: A study of expert, novice, and postulant teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education, 3, 147-157.

Grant, G. E. (1987, April). Transforming content knowledge into work tasks: Teaching reasoning in four subject areas. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Washington, D. C.

Grossman, P., & Gudmundsdottir, S. (1987, April). Teachers and texts: An expert/novice comparison in English. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Washington, D. C.

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1990). Curriculum stories: Four case studies of social studies teaching. In C. Day, M. Pope, & P. Denicolo (Eds.), Insight into teachers' thinking and practice (pp. 107-118). London: Falmer Press.

Gudmundsdottir, S., & Shulman, L. S. (1989). Pedagogical knowledge in social studies. In J. Lowyck & C. M. Clark (Eds.), Teacher thinking and professional action (pp. 23-34). Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press.

Housner, L. D., & Griffey, D. C. (1985). Teacher cognition: Differences in planning and interactive decision-making between experienced and inexperienced teachers. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 56, 45-53.

Leinhardt, G., & Fienberg, J. (1989). Integration of lesson structure and teachers' subject-matter knowledge. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, Learning

Research and Development Centre.

Neale, D. C., Smith, D. C., & Wier, E. A. (1987, April). Teacher thinking in elementary science instruction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Washington, D. C.

Peterson, P. L., & Compeaux, M. A. (1987). Teachers' schemata for classroom events: The mental scaffolding of teachers' thinking during classroom instruction. Teacher and Teacher Education, 3, 319-31.

Robinett, B. W. (1977). Characteristics of an effective second language teacher. In M. Burt, H. Dulay, & M. Finocchiaro (Eds.), Viewpoints on English as a second language (pp. 35-44). New York: Regents Publishing.

Rope, E. (1987, April). Teachers' conceptions of teaching and teaching behaviour: Some differences between expert and novice teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Washington, D. C.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Research, 15, 4-14.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 1-22.

# APPENDIX A

## LESSON NARRATIVE: LINDA

# Appendix A

## Lesson Narrative: Linda

The following is a narrative of a lesson by Linda, one of the experienced teachers in the study. The lesson is from Linda's course on reading at the lower intermediate level and was observed on August 1, 1991. The narrative is composed from the tape recording made of the lesson and from the field notes made by the researcher as the lesson was being observed. Numbers in the parentheses refer to the time.

The room in which Linda teaches is furnished with desks and chairs facing each other. During the teaching, Linda moves about the classroom as she pleases. Her voice is loud and her manner cheerful. At times, she laughs or uses humorous remarks when she asks students questions. She appears to maintain a cheerful atmosphere in the classroom by being relaxed herself so as to keep the students relaxed and comfortable. Sixteen students were present on the day of the observation, approximately half of them were French Canadian, the rest from Europe and the far East.

(9:30) Linda enters the classroom approximately 30 minutes before the class begins and corrects assignments written by the students. Later, as the students arrive, she greets each with "Hello." She talks briefly with them and sometimes comments on their assignments.

(10:00) At the scheduled time for the beginning of the class, Linda looks around the room to see if all are present and asks, "Are you ready?" They chorus, "Yes." She begins with comments on the assignments she has just corrected:

> Oh, it's important to be able to write under pressure as well as to have lots of time at home. So I was interested in comparing what you did under the time constraint yesterday as compared to being able to do something at home like writing opinions in your reading journals. Your organization is still there, and that's good. But the structure, (in a tone of disappointment) oh, wow, did you? Raise your hand if you re-read your paragraphs after you wrote them.

There is discussion among the students. Then Linda continues:

> If you re-read your paragraphs, re-read your paragraphs after you wrote them, put up your hands. (A few raise their hands). I want to see who re-read them. OK, thanks. The course is coming to an end, but I want to make a suggestion to you, something that we do in the winter, and if you end the session, well, you lose your English, this is the practice. When you write something, check it, then go away, do something else. Go for dinner or whatever. Come back and re-read it and you can find your errors. Then wait to the next morning, get into something else, go to bed. The next morning come back. So you've got time periods in between checking. This is your goal. Your goal should be to find all those mistakes, some of these are in green marks (in the assignments), yourself. That should be all right. And it's very difficult, I realize. But if you are going to be successful in the language you have to be able to self-monitor. I am monitoring your reading right now. I'm monitoring everything you do. But you should also be monitoring.

Linda asks an inattentive student, "What did I just say?" The student manages to repeat most of her points. She continues to probe, "Why is this important?" The student replies that it is to find mistakes. She addresses the whole class:

> If you are going to be successful in your language you have to find your own errors. That is what you should be aware of when you continue on in English. You should find your own errors in writing. That's the easiest thing to do. Because you can see it. You can leave it. You can go back to it. And see them. It's harder when you're speaking. But you should by now be aware of some of the errors you're consistently making. And if you know one or two or three things that you are making mistakes in you should constantly be listening for them when you speak. For example, the most obvious example is "me" and "I." If you know you are doing that, then you have to really, really try to eliminate that error from your speech. You can't eliminate all your errors at once, but choose one or choose two and work on them very hard.

The classroom is very quiet. Linda continues:

> Now I had an interesting example in section I of a student who gave an oral presentation, and every third or fourth word he filled with garbage, so he said, "Oh, the environment is a, like you know, it's a problem. Oh, does a lot, like you know, pollution, you know, and pollution is a real problem, like you know, like dirty waters, like you know, the problem." That was what he doing. And so at the end of his oral presentation, I pointed these out and said he was putting all this garbage in between his words. And he said, "Yes I know I am." He sounds good. He sounds better than I just did. He sounds good. The other

> students think he is very fluent. So I said, "Why you do this." He said, "I can't pick up my next word." But I said, "But you have a very high vocabulary." He said, "I just can't think of doing it." I said, "It's just like biting your finger nails. If you bite your finger nails, in order to stop it, it requires a lot of self-discipline. You have to stop and say, OK, I'm conscious and I'm not going to bite my finger nails." So I told you repeatedly the only thing you can do was to self-discipline and be very aware....You must practice all weekend. Begin an entire fifteen minutes oral presentation without once saying "oh, like, you know." So it's possible it requires first of all self-monitoring. So you have to be aware of what your problem is. Secondly, it requires a lot, a lot, a lot of self-determination and self-control. Now there is one thing that you have to work on, and that was get rid of the garbage. So what I want you to do between now and the end of the course is to think of what your particular weakness is and to concentrate on it. Because once you become aware of what you are doing and self-monitor, then you will without doubt be successful in the second language. But if you never try to correct yourself you will probably be mediocre in the second language. You may get to a certain level, but you will never be wonderful because you haven't become aware of yourself. It's like being very passive and letting someone else make the corrections for you.

Linda delivers this speech slowly and clearly, stressing the important words in her sentences. The classroom is very quiet and all the students seem to be attentive. When she finishes, she asks, "Do you understand what I am saying? Have I answered your questions? OK, I'll give back your papers."

(10:38) Linda returns students' reading journals and reminds the students that the weakest part of the assignments are not grammar but carelessness because many did not re-read their assignments after they had finished writing. Then Linda asks, "OK? Any questions? No? Problems? I still need seven, seven reading journals. Who's going to give the reading journals today?" Seven students are asked to hand in their reading journals.

(10:40) Linda: "Now I haven't introduced our guest Jinyuan. Jinyuan is from China. She did a lot of studies in English in China and came over to Canada to study for her Master of Education. She is very interested in how North Americans learn English. So she is coming to watch you guys in action. OK." Some students talk quietly. Linda: "Some of you might have met Jinyuan in the afternoon class." Some indicate that they have. Linda: "OK. I'd like you to introduce yourself to her. Tell her who you are, where you are from, and one interesting thing about yourself." Linda asks the student next to her to start the self-introduction. He does, and is followed by other students. During this, when a student mispronounces a word, Linda immediately corrects her. When another student mentions something of particular interest, Linda comments on it humorously and asks other students to give their opinions. Sometimes Linda uses smiles, laughs, or humorous remarks to encourage shy students to say more in their self-introduction. When a delicate and exquisite girl says she wants to be a policewoman, several students applaud to show their support. Linda suggests that the girl may have to "live on the edge," but the girl replies that she only wants to stay inside the office.

The girl has long hair to her waist, and Linda suggests that she will have to cut it. All the boys agree. The classroom fills with laughter. Students seem to be enjoying the lesson in such a jovial atmosphere.

When the last student finishes her self-introduction, Linda gives each student a copy of the reading comprehension exercise without returning students' written exercises.

(10:50) Linda: "All right. OK. I did terrible photocopy job this morning. I wasn't careful so I had to write the names and part of the words on the board. It was terrible I didn't check. I was going to put the tutor for the photocopies again, then I decided that was not a good thing to do after we all talked about pollution. This is a primary copy from the board." Students read the article and she continues to write on the board.

(10:55) Linda: "OK. I'll give you time to think over the explanations. But I think most of you are using the words properly. There is only one that I think causes a problem: during." Linda asks a student, "George, give me a sentence using during." George: "During the summer I studied English." Linda: "OK. Good." Linda turns to another student, "Shantao, give me another one." Shantao is not clear what she should do. Linda: "Yes, think of a sentence using during." Shantao: "During I ate supper I went out." Linda corrects her, "While I ate supper. During, did you hear his example?" She asks George to repeat his sentence. Then she asks Shantao to make a sentence with "during." Shantao: "During the springs...." Linda: "Oh, I want your supper one. OK?" Shantao: "During the vacation...." Linda: "I want your supper one. I want your first example. I want you to fix it." She repeats George's sentence, "So during the summer I studied English. During your first example, you are talking about dinner." Shantao: "During the evening...." Linda: "OK. During the evening? You still got out of it." She tries to turn back to the dinner, "During my dinner" Shantao: "During my dinner" Linda: "What happened?" Shantao replies, "My parents came to my home." Linda: "Think about George's example. During the summer I studied English. During my dinner, I?" Shantao replies, "I went out." Linda: "While you were eating your dinner you went out?" Shantao explains, "During the dinner time I went out because I had already eat my supper so I go out." Linda: "So you wonder why they were eating this supper?" Linda explains to Shantao and students in class, "During dinner, I read a book. Or I watch children. I'm not saying you should. OK. I remember some of your words during your interviews with likes and dislikes. A lot of people said, 'During three years he is playing tennis, something like that." She shows the right usage to the class, "He has played tennis for three years or he has played tennis since three years ago. But not during. OK. I don't think we need to go over this. Is there anybody who doesn't understand?" One student: "Seldom." Linda: "Give me an example with seldom." Another student replies that seldom means not very often. Linda: "Right. Give me an example." Another student: "Seldom I go to the party." Linda: "Really? Good girl. OK. Not very often. Do you have any questions?" One student: "Earlier." Linda: "Sorry, earlier. Give me an example. Give me an example of earlier." One student: "She came to study earlier." Linda: "Earlier than, oh, I came to the class earlier today, earlier than yesterday." One student: "More early?" Linda: "More early. I mean that's the idea. Early, earlier, earliest."

(11:00) Linda: "Do you have any questions? OK. Then, first we will read paragraphs, then what do you think we're going to do? Answer my question, (giving students a meaningful smile) then what do you think you are going to do?" Some: "Summary?" Linda: (with emphasis) "No, no, not the summary. Well, you know, (drawling) the main ideas of each paragraph until you get all right this time, right? OK. Oh, yes, that's a mistake you guys made. Oh, yes, stand up, Dorothy and Mary. (To the class) Answer my question. Who is taller?" Students: "Mary is taller than Dorothy." Linda asks another tall boy named Dom to stand up, "Then who is the tallest?" Some reply, "Dom is."

Linda: "Do you have any questions? OK. Would you read, please?" At this point, she asks students to read aloud. The article describes the early life of some famous people in the world. Some of them even failed at school. Linda: "Excuse me, what is meant by unaware? Out of conscious. Don't know. OK. Next, please." Linda corrects the student when she mispronounces the words, "Failed, identified, talent, succeed." Now Linda explains, "Right. Because you go to school first. Then you talk about life. Life really starts after you finish school. OK. So who succeeded in later life, later on, you know, when you are old like me, you did not do well at school. Is that clear? Next, Dom?" Linda corrects him, "Prime Minister, Good. Any questions? Do you all know that Winston Churchill? He failed at the grade school." Students talk quietly. Linda: "So just because you are having trouble with English now doesn't necessarily mean that you will always have trouble with English, does it? If you work hard you will be successful. OK. (To a student) Would you read, please?" Linda corrects her, "Inventories, mathematician, very good. OK. Who is Tom Edison?" One student tries to find the answer in the article. Linda: "Don't look at your paper. It doesn't tell you. What did he invent? What does Edison invent?" One student: "Light bulb." Linda: "Great. Light bulb. Without Edison, we won't have a light bulb. We won't be able to see in here." Some talk quietly. Linda: "Oh, Edison also was not good at mathematics. But he was good at creative things. OK. That's interesting, I say. Newton, who was so famous for mathematics, was not a good student. This just goes to show that even if you are not a good student it doesn't necessarily mean that you are not going to do well in life. Any questions in that paragraph? Any vocabulary?" One student: "Nevertheless." Linda: "Nevertheless? Yes. Zeumoler was (drawling) very, very tired, nevertheless she did homework anyway. A good student. OK. (To the student next to her) Would you read, please?" Linda corrects, "Go the. (with emphasis) Yes. What's? Do you understand? Make a sentence and we'll talk about it. Do you have any questions? OK. Is that clear?" Linda asks several students to read the paragraphs one by one. She asks the students who are very quiet to read and then asks them to explain the meaning of specific words. Most of the students get an opportunity to read or answer the questions in class.

(11:15) Linda: "Now, do you have any questions? Now there are only one, two, three, only four paragraphs, four main ideas. I want you to get them. OK. When students start to work on the main ideas, she only guides when needed.

(11:55) Linda: "OK. Could I get your attention, please? Seven of you are giving your oral presentation about your reading journals and the discussion tomorrow.

You have to give your oral summary and your responses. But you then have to encourage the rest of the class to discuss the issue. What are you going to do in order to make the class participate?" Students chorus, "Ask some questions." Linda: (appearing satisfied) "So be prepared with some questions about your topic, to ask the rest of the class so they will be able to participate. I am looking at how you interact the class. Your first presentation is how you present the information to the class. Now look at the interaction between you and the rest of the class. OK. Seven of you for tomorrow. We will need to answer these questions for Tuesday. And remember you hand in your conclusions on Tuesday and your sheets showing how far you've got. OK. Any questions? See you tomorrow."

The class is over, but many students remain in the classroom either for help with their homework or for friendly talk with Linda.

# APPENDIX B

## LESSON NARRATIVE: Alice

# Appendix B:

# Lesson Narrative: Alice

The following is a narrative of a lesson by Alice, one of the beginning teachers in the study. The lesson is from Alice's course on listening/pronunciation at the lower intermediate level and was observed on July 15, 1991. The narrative is composed from the tape recording made of the lesson and from the field notes made by the researcher as the lesson was being observed. Numbers in parentheses refer to the time.

The room in which Alice teaches is furnished with desks and chairs facing each other. During the teaching, Alice moves about the classroom as she pleases. She has good pronunciation and she is quick in her movement. Fourteen students were present on the day of the observation, approximately half of them were French Canadian, the rest from Europe and Japan.

(12:50) Alice enters the classroom approximately 10 minutes before the class begins and talks with her students. She speaks rapidly, asking if they enjoyed the play prepared by the students at the residence on Saturday evening (Alice was the supervisor of the play). Alice asks, "How many people went to see the play?" Students smile at her. Alice is pleased to see the reaction of her students about the play. She leads them into a discussion, "What did you think? Did you like the play, I mean? Yes? What was your favourite part?" She asks several students their opinions about the play. Then she comments on the play briefly.

(1:00) At the scheduled time for the beginning of class, Alice writes something on the board and asks, "Are you ready, everybody?" Students chorus, "Yes." She gives each student a copy of a poem describing little boys' different games and their opinions about the games. Alice: "Has everyone got one of these?" Students reply that they have. Alice: "Yes. OK. I will read the first line. You repeat. Are you clear? OK." She reads the poem clearly and rapidly, and the students follow her without showing any difficulty. After reading, Alice: "Any words in the poem you can't understand?" One student: "Rather?" Alice: "Rather? Can anyone explain rather? It's another word for prefer. I prefer to play at home. OK. Can anyone guess why I chose this poem?" Another student: "I can't understand giggles." Alice: "Giggles? You don't know giggles? Who can explain giggles? Anyone? Laugh (imitating the sound of a giggle) OK?" Another student: "Grins?" Alice: "Grins? Anyone knows what grins is? Smiles, everyone is happy and grins (grinning). Any other words?" Some: "Hugs?" Alice: "Hugs? OK. When you hold the cat, or a baby, OK. You are hugging your baby. OK." She acts out to show the meaning "hug."

After the explanation, Alice continues, "Besides the new words, can you guess a reason that I am choosing this poem? Remember what we studied last week?" One student: "The pronunciation of the words." Alice: "The pronunciation of the s endings on verbs. OK. So you have hugs, tugs, giggles, rolls, and kisses, and grins, and huddles, and grins. OK. Can we go through the poem together now? All the students and listen to the endings of the verbs, OK." She reads the poem and the students follow her. After the reading, Alice: "Do you understand the poem? OK. The first two lines, this half of the room read. OK. The second two lines, this half of the room. Back to you for the next two, for the next two, then altogether for the last two. Does that make sense? OK. So do you know what you are reading?" A student enters and Alice asks him not to be late next time. Then she repeats her words, "OK. We are going to read the poem. Each half of the room is reading two lines. OK. I'll start again. All right." Students read by turns.

(1:10) Alice: (smiling) "Nice, well done, OK. (Speaking rapidly) Now let's go through our rules about the endings on verbs. OK. Where do you see s endings on verbs?" One student: "Pardon me?" Alice: (drawling) "With s endings on verbs?" Some: "Third person singular." Alice: "Excellent, third person singular. OK. So can you give me that form of help?" Students: "helps." Alice: "Good. How about this?" She writes hope on the board. Students: "Hopes." Alice: "Good." She writes add, cause, smile, crush on the board and students repeat the verbs with s endings. Some students just add s on cause and crush. Alice corrects them, "Causes, and brushes, you add es syllable. Does anyone remember when you add the extra syllable? When there is a sibilant sound at the end, or the hissing sound, OK. So take the example (sh) in crashes, or (z) in causes, OK. So it is sibilant. Please remember the hissing sound, it's easier to remember." Alice writes causes, brushes, crises on the board, "OK. That's all sibilants. Can you think of another word with a sibilant sound at the end?" One student: "Misses?" Alice: "Good, OK, misses. What about those in the poem? The ones in the poem? Can you find them?" One student: "Kisses?" Alice: "Good. Remember the one crises. These are the rules for s endings on verbs. OK, sibilant sounds you add extra syllable. All the others it's just s, helps, works."

(1:15) Alice: (speaking rapidly) "OK. I'll begin a game. I am going on a camping trip and I am going to bring sleeping bags. I want each of us to go around and we'll have a big, huge list by the time we've done (laughing). So Charlie would say I am going on a camping trip and I am going to bring, and add something, and you also use mine. OK." Students show confusion. Alice: (apparently ignorant of their confusion) "You guys have the hardest job to remember them all. OK. We'll see how you will do. OK. I am going on a camping trip and I am going to bring sleeping bags." Then she asks Charlie to start. Charlie: (confused) "I ask somebody?" Alice: "No. You are going to say I am going on a camping trip and I am going to bring, and add something and then repeat mine. OK" Charlie: "I am going to the camping trip. I am going to...." Alice: "To bring something?" Charlie: "I am going to bring a sandwich?" Alice: "Anything you like." Charlie: "I am going to bring some sandwich." Alice corrects, "Sandwiches. That's the good one for sibilant sound (ch), sandwiches. OK. And?" Charlie: (still confused) "Are you going to some?" Alice explains, "No. You add, sleeping bags." Charlie: "OK, ya, and you going to the camping trip and you bring something? And you are going, are you want to bring something?" Alice: "All you need to do is say I am going on a camping trip and I am going to bring sandwiches and sleeping bags. OK. Try again." She notices that Charlie appears embarrassed, "That's OK. Don't worry. You are the first one to begin the game. Everyone else watches you and they say OK. Now you know what to do. OK." Charlie: "I am going to the camping trip. And I am going to bring, I am going to bring some sandwiches and you are going to bring some sandwiches." Alice: "Sleeping bags. Good, that's it. You got it. OK. All right." Alice: (To the second next to Charlie) "Your turn." Students start to make sentences one by one. She corrects students with plural nouns if they use singular nouns. When the last student finishes his turn, there is applause. Alice: (laughing) "Very good. Looks like a good camping trip."

(1:30) Alice: "OK. I copied another poem for us. There are lots of plurals in it. OK. There are two places that you find s endings are verbs and the third person singular and the plurals. OK. All right. When you look at this poem, pay attention to the endings on all the plural nouns, OK. I will read the line and you repeat after me. OK." She reads the poem and the students follow her. The poem describes a boy's hobby of collecting various useless things. Alice: "Any words you do not understand?" One student appears confused about the meaning of the last sentence, "Love these things with all his sawl?" Alice seems unaware of the student's confusion, and says, "Soul. OK. Anything else? Do you understand the basic meaning of the poem?" The same student: "I don't know why people call this junk?" Alice: "Yes, you know junks." This student: "All the people are laughing at him?" Alice: "Yes, exactly. (Explaining) All these things were very precious to Hector. And all the people could not see how special they were, means they were nothing, garbage." This student: "From the thing junk is the people, when you call a person junk because people don't play with these people or what?" Alice: (noticing the student's problem) "They would not call Hector junk. They were calling his collection, or all things he had found, they were saying that's just junk. They didn't see the beauty. OK, make sense?" Another student: "I can't understand rusty bells, rusty?" Alice: "Rusty? Can anyone explain rusty?" One student replies, "It's old." Alice: "When metal is wet and turns brown and starts to crumble, we call it rusty." Two students talk quietly about rusty. Alice: "Oh, rusty? It's like, cars get rusty, brownish. OK. Anything else? We'll leave that there for now. So do you remember the rules for s endings?" Students chorus, "Yes." Alice: "There is a sibilant sound, there is es; other sounds just s, OK. We are going to spend the next two weeks doing little plays, some drama, OK. When all of us meet together, we will have a chance to make up. OK."

(1:40) Alice gives each student copies of a story describing two babies talking in the hospital after they were born. Alice: "We'll start to read together and then break up into small groups." She asks two students to read in class, one as the deep voice and the other as the high voice. When students mispronounce words, she corrects them and explains the meaning of these words. Several students are asked to read the paragraphs. After the reading, Alice asks, "Does everyone understand what is happening here? It's two babies talking in the hospital for the first time."

(1:50) Alice: "OK? Does everyone understand? OK. I want everyone of you in this room to find a new partner. Everyone, stand up. Find somebody you have not practised with before, someone different from last week, OK, and hopefully someone whose native language is different from yours, OK." Students move around and form pairs. She helps some students to find new partners when she notices they are looking around. Alice: "OK. Just read the play again with your partner. OK." Students read the play by themselves and Alice guides when needed.

(2:20) Alice: "Is there everyone had the chance to go through the play at least once? Yes? Have you been through once? Yes?" Some students reply that they have not. Alice: "That's OK. You can keep your copies. OK. I am wondering how people are doing the required interview assignment. How many people have found someone to interview?" Some students raise their hands. Alice: "Good, OK. How many people have made up their questions?" Some other students raise their hands. Alice: "OK. You are doing well, good. The rest of you, you need to get moving. You don't want to leave it to the very last week. You will have lots of problems to get the tape-recorder. OK." She gives each group a black tape for the interview assignment and talks briefly about the procedures for borrowing the tape-recorders. Then she gives each group 10 minutes to discuss the interview assignment in class.

After the class, some students remain in the classroom to discuss the interview arrangement. Two students ask Alice to clear up problems that they may encounter in their interviews.

# Vita

## Personal Information

Name: Jinyuan Zheng

Origin: Danyang, Jiangsu, China

Birthdate: August 18, 1957

## Education

| | |
|---|---|
| 1989-1992 | Queen's University (M.Ed.) |
| 1980-1984 | Nanjing Normal University, China (B.A.) |
| 1969-1974 | Danyang High School, Danyang, Jiangsu, China |

## Experience

| | |
|---|---|
| 1989-1991 | Research Assistant (Queen's University, Kingston, Ont.) |
| 1985-1988 | ESL teacher (Jingling High School, Nanjing, China) |
| 1976-1979 | Machinist (Danyang, Jiangsu, China) |

## Award

| | |
|---|---|
| 1990-1991 | R. Samuel Mclaughlin Fellowship (Queen's University, Kingston, Ont.) |
| 1989-1990 | Graduate Awards (Queen's University, Kingston, Ont.) |